Mr. President: The House will now resume discussion on Resolution No. 4.

RESOLUTIONS

4 & 5. Grant of further Constitutional Reforms

4. As a further step towards complete responsible Government, this Council recommends to the Government to place the Departments of Education, Medicine and Public Works under popular Ministers. (Mr. T. K. Nayar)

Amendment

Delete the words "As a further step towards" and insert "In order to attain;"

Between the word "place" and the word "the" add the word 'all" in line 2 of the resolution;

Omit the words "of Education, Medicine and Public Works" (Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar)

5. This Council recommends to the Government that they may be pleased to make an immediate announcement establishing full responsible Government under the aegis of His Highness the Maharaja. (Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar)

***Mr. A. Eachara Menon** *(Chittur-Rural):* Sir, I rise to a point of order. Mr. T. K. Nayar's resolution reads: "*As a further step towards complete responsible Government this Council recommends to the Government to place the Departments of Education, Medicine and Public Works under popular Ministers.*" By means of an amendment the Hon'ble Member Mr. Subramania Ayyar wants to change the meaning of the resolution itself. The resolution, if amended as suggested by Mr. Subramania Ayyar would read: "*In order to attain complete responsible Government this Council recommends to the Government to place all the Departments under popular Ministers.*" Is this then an amendment, Sir?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* Why a point of order on the amendment at this stage? The amendment was admitted and I was asked to move, and I have even begun my speech already.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Pazhayannur):* There was no ruling on any point of order.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* But the Chairman admitted it.

*Speech not corrected by the hon'ble member

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. President: Was this amendment admitted ?

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Mulankunnathukavu):* No point of order was raised.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* He was only moving his amendment when the House rose. In fact there was no time then to raise a point of order. He had not even finished his speech.

Mr. President: A point of order cannot be raised in the middle of a speech and therefore Mr. Eachara Menon's.....

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* He was continuing his speech on the amendments.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* I had finished saying two sentences when the clock struck 5.

Mr. President : Do you like to continue your speech, or do you want a ruling on your point of order ?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara) :* I say, the point of order is too late.

Mr. President: There you are wrong. If a member moves an amendment and continues making a speech, the point of order can be raised as soon as the member resumes his seat. You are still in possession of the House. If you give way, then, the point of order can be raised. The hon'ble member is in time in raising the point of order. The President has not given a ruling the other day.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* Yesterday, he began speaking and he has not finished his speech. Nobody raised a point of order then and he is pleading the law of estoppel now. *(Laughter).*

Mr. President: Today also he will be allowed to speak. The point is, since the hon'ble member has started a speech, he can now insist upon his right of concluding that speech if he wants, in which case the Hon'ble Member Mr. Eachara Menon can raise his point of order at the end of that speech.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* I do not wish to stand on that technical point. If the chair is going to give a ruling on the point of order, I submit I may be heard before a ruling is given.

Mr. President: Then you want the point of order to be argued? The hon'ble member can say what he has to say on Mr. Eachara Menon's point of order.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* From what I understand from the hon'ble member who has objected to my amendment, he seems to say that the amendment proposed goes further than what is contained in the main resolution. What I wish to submit is that the amendment is in order, because it does not raise or relate to a subject which is totally foreign to the main resolution and as such, excepting to improve the scope of the resolution, the amendment does not propose to do anything else. I submit such an amendment may be allowed to be moved and it is perfectly in order.

*മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. കെ. നായർ: സർ, എന്റെ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശത്തെ തീരെ മാറ്റുവാനായിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു ഭേദഗതിയാണ് മിസ്റ്റർ സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യർ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതു്. എന്റെ പ്രമേയത്തിന്റെ പ്രധാന ഉദ്ദേശം ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ ഈ നിയമസഭ ഗവൺമെന്റിനോട് പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നില്ലെന്നുള്ളതാണ്. പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം വേണ്ട എന്നല്ല ഞാൻ പറയുന്നതു്. എന്റെ പ്രമേയത്തിൽ പറയുന്ന മൂന്നു വകുപ്പുകൾക്കു പകരം അഞ്ചോ ആറോ വകുപ്പുകളാക്കുവാനോ, അല്ലെങ്കിൽ അതിൽ നിന്നു് ഒരു വകുപ്പു് എടുത്തുകളയുവാനോ വേണ്ടി ഒരു ഭേദഗതി കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ അതു് ഈ പ്രമേയത്തിൽ അടങ്ങുമായിരുന്നു. എന്റെ പ്രമേയത്തിൽ ഞാൻ ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം വേണമെന്നു് ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നില്ല. നേരെ മറിച്ചു് എന്റെ മാന്യസ്നേഹിതൻ മിസ്റ്റർ സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യരുടെ ഭേദഗതി പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം ഇപ്പോൾ വേണം എന്നാണു്. എന്റെ പ്രമേയം അദ്ദേഹത്തിനു മനസ്സിലാക്കിട്ടില്ലെന്നു തോന്നുന്നു. എന്റെ പ്രമേയത്തിൽ പറയുന്ന ഉദ്ദേശത്തോടു് ഈ ഭേദഗതി ഒരിക്കലും യോജിക്കുന്നില്ല. ഉദാഹരണം പറയുകയാണെങ്കിൽ പഴയന്നൂർ നിയോജകമണ്ഡലത്തിൽ ഒരു മുൻസിപ്പാലിറ്റി സ്ഥാപിച്ചു കിട്ടണമെന്ന ഒരു പ്രമേയം ഞാൻ കൊണ്ടുവന്നുവെന്നു വിചാരിക്കുക. അപ്പോൾ എന്റെ മാന്യസ്നേഹിതൻ ഒരു ഭേദഗതി അവതരിപ്പിച്ചു് കൊച്ചി രാജ്യത്തുള്ള എല്ലാ വില്ലേജുകളിലും മുൻസിപ്പാലിറ്റി വേണം എന്നു വാദിക്കുന്നതുപോലെയാണിതു്. എന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശം പഴയന്നൂക്കു് ഒരു മുൻസിപ്പാലിറ്റി സ്ഥാപിച്ചുകിട്ടുവാനാണു്. കൊച്ചിരാജ്യത്തിലെ എല്ലാ വില്ലേജുകളിലും മുൻസിപ്പാലിറ്റി വേണ്ട എന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായക്കാരനല്ല ഞാൻ. ഇങ്ങിനെ പ്രായോഗികമായുള്ള പ്രമേയം കൊണ്ടുവരുമ്പോൾ ഈ വിധത്തിലുള്ള ഭേദഗതികൾ കൊണ്ടുവന്നു് അതിനെ ഇല്ലാതാക്കുകയായിരിക്കും ചെയ്യുന്നതു്. ഈ പ്രമേയത്തിൽ ഞാൻ പറയുന്നതു് മൂന്നു വകുപ്പുകൾ വിട്ടുകിട്ടണമെന്നാണു്. അഞ്ചാമത്തെ റസല്യൂഷനിൽ പറയുന്ന പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണംവേണമെന്നു്. ഈ നിയമസഭക്കു് ഇതല്ല, പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണമാണു് വെണ്ടതെങ്കിൽ എന്റെ പ്രമേയത്തെ തള്ളിക്കളയണം. എന്റെ ഏറ്റവും ചുരുങ്ങിയ ഉദ്ദേശത്തെ തീരെ നെഗറ്റീവു ചെയ്യുന്ന ഒരഭിപ്രായമാണു് ഈ ഭേദഗതി. അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഇതിൽ ഞങ്ങൾക്കനുകൂലമായ ഒരു റൂളിംഗു് തരണമെന്നു ഞാനപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Sir, The object of the two resolutions is the same.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* No, No.

*Speech not corrected by the hon'ble membar.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. President : According to him it is the same.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi) :* Sir, According to Mr. Nayar, this is a further step towards complete responsible government. Mr. Ayyar wants complete responsible government. The ultimate aim contempleted by both resolutions is full responsible government. On this point both are agreed. Mr. Nayar suggests one method of attaining it and Mr. Ayyar suggests another method. Mr. Nayar wants 5 departments to be given to the Minister and Mr. Ayyar wants 7 departments and, therefore, there is some difference in the method suggested and the amendment is entirely within the scope of the resolution and strictly in order.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* Sir, The rule as to amendments are these.—

An amendment must be relevant to and within the scope of the subject matter of the clause or the motion to which it relates and further an amendment on a question must not be inconsistent with any previous decision on the same question given at the same stage of any bill or motion. The next is, the President may refuse to put an amendment which in his opinion is frivolous. These three seem to be the guiding principles. Now, on this question, the analogy raised by my Hon'ble Friend, Mr. T. K. Nayar is not correct. Suppose he brings a resolution to the effect that there should be a veterinary hospital at Cheruthuruthi and suppose another member moves an amendment that that dispensary must have such and such a size or must have a court yard. Here the main resolution relates to the grant of a further instalment of responsible government. It is only a qualification of that motion that is contained in Mr. Ayyar's amendment. The whole underlying idea is the grant of further responsible government. In Mr. Nayar's motion it is stated "as a further step towards complete responsible government," so that those words are the underlying object of the resolution. The idea underlying the motion is the attainment of comlete responsible government. Mr. Nayar suggests one step and Mr. Ayyar suggests another step more. Therefore, my submission to this House is, as the underlying idea of Mr. Nayar's motion is the grant of complete responsible Government, Mr. Ayyar's amendment is in order.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Sir, I think that the amendment does not come within the scope of the resolution, because Mr. Nayar's resolution only asks for a further step to be taken in the attainment of complete responsible government. That, of course, is a very small request. To say that its implication is the attainment of complete responsible government and, therefore, to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

give us the whole thing immediately cannot of course be an amendment. It is of course open to the hon'ble member not to vote for Mr. Nayar's resolution but to move his resolution later on. But, I don't think that his amendments are in order and within the scope of Mr. Nayar's resolution.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara)* : Now Sir, If the contention is that resolutions Nos. 4 and 5 relate to two independent and distinct subjects, I could have understood the objections raised that the amendment is not in order. But the principle embodied in both the resolutions is the same as was pointed out by my friend Mr. Mathai. If my amendment is not allowed now, then, after resolution No. 4 is discussed, resolution No. 5 more or less on the same subject will have to be again threshed out and a fresh decision of the House will have to be taken. I submit, it is unnecessary and therefore I say my amendment may be accepted.

Mr. President: The relevant Standing Order applicable to a decision on the point of order is Standing Order No. 24. It says.—

"An amendment must be relevant to, and within the scope of, the subject matter of the clause or motion to which it relates" and more particularly we are concerned with the restriction that the amendment must be within the scope of the motion. And now the Chair has to interpret what exactly is meant by the words "within the scope of the motion" and whether the amendment of the Hon'ble Member, Mr. Subramania Ayyar, can be deemed to be within the scope of the motion moved by Mr. T. K. Nayar. It is the right of every member of this House to raise a debate on any particular issue that he wants and to ask that the House should give a positive decision on that issue and that issue alone. Any amendment which will result in the defeat of the object of that member is an amendment which comes outside the scope of that motion. In other words, in the case of an amendment, no member of this House should attempt to torpedo as it were the essential point of view of the member who moves the motion *(Hear, hear)*. I think the analogy that the Hon'ble Member Mr. T. K. Nayar gave is a very forcible and forceful analogy. If, for example, he moved a motion that a veterinary hospital should be located at Pazhayannur, it is certainly torpedoing that motion to say that veterinary hospitals should be started in all the villages of the State. The hon'ble member wants a division of the House only on a small request and it would be defeating his very purpose if the scope of the amendment is extended as to include the case of all the villages. Applying the same analogy, yow will find that whatever may be ultimate object of the hon'ble members, what the Hon'ble Member, Mr. T. K. Nayar, wants to raise

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

in the fore-front of the debate is this: that as a further step towards responsible government and as a step alone, some more subjects should be transferred to the control of the Minister, whereas the amendment of the Hon'ble Member, Mr. Subramania Ayyar, is simply tantamount to asking the establishment of complete responsible government straight-a-way, and it is clearly outside the scope of the resolution of the Hon'ble Member, Mr. T. K. Nayar. Therefore, the amendment is entirely out of order and Mr. T. K. Nayar is entitled to raise a debate on that narrow issue.

But I agree with the Hon'ble Member Mr. Subramania Ayyar that the House should not waste the time in repeating the debate. As a matter of convenience and purely as question of procedure, a comprehensive discussion might take place, both on the resolution of Mr. T. K. Nayar and on resolution No. 5 of Mr. Subramania Ayyar. Resolutions Nos. 4 and 5 are typical of the two views held by the members. All other resolutions will automatically lapse. Mr. T. K. Nayar's resolution will be put to vote first.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* Sir, I move the following resolution: "*This Council recommends to the Government that they may be pleased to make an immediate announcement establishing full responsible government under the aegis of His Highness the Maharaja*". In the few sentences that I was allowed to mention the other day on the amendment which I had given notice of to resolution No. 4 and which has been now torpedoed by the point of order raised by my friend, the Hon'ble Member for Chittur-Rural and so ably supported by the mover of the resolution, I had stated a few facts for the consideration of this Hon'ble House as to why my resolution should be accepted. The announcement of the reforms in Cochin State brought in a good deal of attention throughout the length and breadth of the continent of India, both in Indian India and in British India. The several aspects of the reforms announced by His Highness the Maharaja were scrutinised in great detail both in the press and on the platform by very eminent politicians in the country. While some characterised it as a camouflage to conceal the autocracy that is rampant in the State, some others hailed it as the dawn of a new era heralding responsible government in native States. While many said that of the three powers in the State—His Highness the Maharaja, the Diwan and the Minister—by the operation of this Act, the middle office will secure more prestige and more powers than before, there were others who sympathetically viewed the reforms and stated that it was a move in the right direction. The view of the politicians of the State was equally divided; but then as the first perceptible penetration into the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

citadel of native Indian autocracy, these reforms were welcomed as an epoch. When the first rush of enthusiasm cooled down and when the various provisions of the new Act were scrutinised with a critical eye, lacuna was visible to the naked eye and ere long it was soon apparent that what is contained beneath all this paraphernalia was after all not much. Between the Diwan of the State and the Minister, if a comparison were to be instituted, while the one was supreme in his own authority both in financial matters and otherwise, the pale figure of the Minister was standing side by side always wanting doles from the reserved half. It may be, Sir, and I am willing to concede that also and proclaim here, that being the father of the Constitution, the present Diwan has been sympathetic to the representations of the Minister during all these years. But then, the difference is this. It is one thing to claim a right and it is quite another to beg for a dole. Even if the representations made by the Hon'ble Minister are sympathetically met by the Government, it is one thing to say that he asserts a right and it is another thing to say that he gets some concessions from the Diwan. Many deficiencies in the Act were thus visible. The transfer of some departments itself was anomalous in this respect. Industries have been divided into two—major industries and minor industries—and while minor industries were transferred, major industries was a reserved subject. While Agriculture is a transferred subject, you find the strange spectacle of irrigation being a reserved subject. I cannot understand how agriculture can be improved without the Department of Irrigation being under the control of the Hon'ble Minister? What is rural development without primary education? Primary education and education of the masses is the most important aspect of rural development and what could the Minister do when this is kept as a close preserve?

Now, coming to the major points, the whole system of administration, as contemplated under the Government of Cochin Act, is what is called a certain system of dyarchy. As the Hon'ble Minister has himself observed during a discussion in this House, it is not even dyarchy but the shadow of dyarchy. This is system of dyarchy so ingeniously devised by Lionel Curtis and adopted in British India; what is that system? The body politic, the constitution, the Government, are sought to be divided under this system. Several politicians including some who are now heads of Governments have vehemently condemned the system and opinions have been expressed in unequivocal terms that this system cannot succeed at all in India. Opinions of ex-Ministers like that of Lala Harikishen Lal were given before the Simon Commission. It was noticed that such a division of the functions of Government,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

such demarcation of the functions of government, such a rigid division of the functions of Government will not work smoothly and will not advance the cause of full responsible government in the country. The most important fact so far as the Act was concerned was this. As I mentioned just now, the kernel of administration, the mainspring of administration, *i.e.* finance, is reserved, is securely preserved in the hands of the executive and the Ministers cannot lay claim to any portion or to have any control over the purse. As is well known, Sir, any system of administration wherein the power of the purse is not vested in the hands of the elected representatives is nothing more than a sham, to use a very mild expression. But, when all is said, I do not shut my eyes to the fact that the event was really an important in one sense. When the divine right of Kings was reigning supreme in the country and the native Princes were tenaciously clinging to the age long traditions of their autocracy, as the first breach in the walls of that autocracy, the new reform was a new epoch in the annals of the country. It was a measure which was welcomed a id with a realisation of the difficulties of the Executive Government and with a realisation of the realities of the situation, the politicians in this State took up the reins of office with the hope to see that ere long they will be able to attain full responsible government.

One other important point which I wish to stress during the discussion of this motion is this. The constitution of the Council itself requires radical changes. Now, of the 58 members in the Council, 20 are nominated. One member represents planters. Another represents landholders and another, commerce. These are three special constituencies. Even assuming that they also form part of the popular representatives in this House, out of the 58 members, 20 are nominated of which 12 are officials and the rest non-officials. It needs no argument on my part to say that twelve votes are always at the disposal of the Government.

Then there is the impression about the nominated bloc, as was mentioned by Dr. Reddy on one occasion, during the discussion of non-confidence motion on the Justice Ministry in the Madras Legislature that the nominated members, being the creation of the Government, will simply obey the creator. I may be wrong. I wish I were wrong. But the impression is there, and when we take into consideration the number of nominated members in the Council, it will be found that they are a handicap in every matter. My submission is this. Out of the total number of 58 members there are only 38 elected members. I wish to state with all the force at my command that the system of nomination in this Council

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

must be abolished. For some time, I may say it may be necessary to reserve a few number of seats for the proper representation of the depressed classes or of any other peculiarly backward interests. But this formidable bloc of 20 sitting on the other side, Sir, put us on the nerves and one must be very bold to bring in a popular measure, because that bloc is firm and they stand together as one force always whereas the votes on the popular side very often gets divided as there are several parties among the elected members. What I submit is this, the system of nomination must be abolished. Elective principle must be applied in regard to the 8 nominated seats, some elective principle for the depressed classes also being devised; I again repeat that the nominated non-official seats must be abolished.

Then, Sir, I wish to submit that the nominated official bloc must go. There have been instances, as the Hon'ble Diwan President knows, where a Ministry continued in office with the strength of the nominated members.

Mr. President: Has that been so here?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* No.

What I submit is this. Such a situation is possible. Coupled with the possibility of such a situation, and the suspicion existing in the minds of the elected non-officials that the nominated bloc will always help the executive, there is an atmosphere created which is not congenial to the development of democratic principles. Of course, comparisons are always invidious. We have got very many good points in our Constitution Act, which are of a very superior nature, when compared with any other native State. I do realise that; but if I may say so, with regard to one or two points, the Mysore Government and the Baroda Government, for instance, have, I think, gone a bit in advance. There out of the 55 members 37 are elected, 9 are nominated non-officials and 9 are officials.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* What is the difference?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* There is difference. Now we have got 12 officials here. In Baroda there are only 9 officials. Of course, I do not wish to make a strong point out of it. It is a very small point. Afte rall, what I wish to state is that we are willing to admit that in very many respects we have gone far in advance, when compared with other States.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* More better than all the Constitutions enacted in all the Indian States.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* There is difference of opinion, Sir. In Mysore, there is a composite and unitary cabinet as it were, non-officials sitting together with the officials and making their voice felt during the debates about all the Departments. At any rate that is the idea we get on going through the Government of Mysore Act. Such a constitution is according to me better than our system, provided the non-official Ministers there are consulted on all important affairs.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* Who are those non-officials?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* They are elected members.

As was mentioned by the Hon'ble Diwan President during a speech in Mysore, even according to our own Constitution, Sir, there is nowhere laid down that the Minister must have the absolute confidence of the majority of the Members of the Legislative Council.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* If that fellow is worth a two pence, he will clear out.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* I am not having an acadamic discussion, Sir.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* On a point of order, Sir, we have established a convention. On the first day I got up it was only to raise a point of order that cutting of one's salary is injurious to the reputation of a Minister, and I said, I would resign forthwith. That has established a convention. Give credit to what is due.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* Now, what I am saying is this.....

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* Why should the Minister get irritated? We speak only against the Government and the Government is to get irritated, if at all.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* It is part of my duty to defend the Government.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* The Hon'ble Minister was saying that he does not welcome interruptions. But he is always interrupting the speech. I think it is improper on the part of the Minister to stand in the way.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* I say it is nowhere laid down that the Minister must have the support of the elected representatives in the Council. But then, a convention has been established and I am glad for that. Without the convention the Ministry is not worth having at all. The principle is that the Minister should have the confidence of the Legislative Council Members. If not, the Ministry is worth nothing. Such a convention has been established. We are thankful to the Government for that and without that I am sure, even the Hon'ble Minister may not care to be in office, because he does not want to be there unless he is supported by the majority. That was the point adverted to in Mysore. There the Act says that out of the four Ministers at least two must be elected non-officials from the Mysore Assembly or the Legislative Council. The main attack on those reforms was that the powers were almost in the hands of the Government and that it need not be necessary that the non-official Ministers should carry the majority of the Council with them. There is yet time for them to establish a convention. That is why the Diwan President during a speech in Mysore Union, I think, made a suggestion and during the discussion he was saying that there is nothing under law in Cochin that the Minister must be responsible to the elected representatives. He said; "I have established a convention whereby he will resign, immediately he finds he is not carrying the majority in the Council." And he proceeded to say rightly too that "such a convention can be created in Mysore and that afterall you need not make a hue and cry that the measure is so inadequate."

If the two non-official members of the Mysore Legislative Council or Assembly join with the bureaucratic bloc and if they work together with the official members and make their voice felt in all their deliberations, the administration of all the departments could be kept under the watchful eye of the joint Executive Council. There is a view held by some people that it is a better system. I am for responsible democratic government. I had occasion to read with pain some remarks from certain quarters on the wisdom of that system and its suitability to our country. But it was immediately corrected and I was relieved. I am a firm believer in the democratic parliamentary system working on the principle that the executive must be responsible to the legislature. This discussion is about the irremovability of executive and the possibility of democracy functioning in spite of the fact that the executive is not responsible to the legislature. What I say is that we want an executive responsible to the legislature. I do not profess to know much about these things. I still believe that the system which now obtains in British India which is a copy of the representative system of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Government as obtaining in England is the best system and we must go a long way in establishing a uniform rule and convention whereby the voice of the elected representatives must be felt by the executive in all matters.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* May I know, Sir, whether there is any constitution which has been framed by law that lays down that the Minister should resign when a no-confidence motion is passed in the House?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* Parliamentary convention. That is an effective answer. It is not a question of law. It is only a convention. One peculiarity of it has been the result of the regular growth of centuries and it is the system whereby the wisdom of ages has been crystalised into constitutional convention and which is the glory of all democratic institutions as it is in the Mother of Parliaments which has been the model of Parliaments all over the world. I do not wish to deviate from that principle. I still stick on to that view that the representative government, the first step for which has been taken in Cochin, is a move in the right direction, and my contention is that we have now reached a stage when we must have full responsible government. I don't wish to go into further details when several members are anxious to speak. But this argument that we are not fit for full responsible government is not correct.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon *(Chittur-Rural):* Nobody has said that.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* I do not mean to enter into a controversy. When the Leader of your party wants only three departments to be transferred now, there is an implication that he admits tacitly that our advancement has progressed only to that stage and that we have not reached the position to demand and have full responsible government.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* It may be for honesty of that party.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* As a member of a political party I cannot subscribe to that view. The position of our party is that we are fit for full responsible government. Having been forced to that conclusion and guided by the dictates of our conviction, we are satisfied that we are ready for full responsible government. It is quite open to any of you to ask for only three departments. Alright. Let them ask for that and let them have it. Now what I wish to say is that in British India, which is far backward with regard to education than any of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

native States, at least Cochin and Travancore, they have been deemed fit to the conferment of provincial autonomy in the Provinces.

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Mulakunnathukavu):* And now ?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* Now the Constitution has not been scrapped. There is only a suspension under section 93 of the Government of India Act. The Governors of Provinces have been proclaiming that they are willing to hand over all the powers to the legislative body if they are prepared to take it up, so that there is no point in saying that simply by suspension under section 93 they have been found not fit. That is quite irrelevant.

We have advanced educationaly and politically. Our political consciousness has developed. The reforms that have been introduced have been worked so far in a responsible manner by the party in power and for all these reasons, we are entitled to have full responsible government. It is my firm belief, Sir, that we have now a responsive government, though not a responsible government. Let not our hopes be shattered.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* What is the difference between the two ?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* The difference is obvious.

It is our fervent hope that His Highness, who has been so graciously pleased to associate elected representatives in the administration of the State, will not hesitate to move forwards immediately —immediate future—at least before the next elections begin— by conferring full responsible government for the people of this historic State.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: സർ, ഞാൻ മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. കെ. നായരുടെ നിശ്ചയത്തോട് യോജിക്കുന്നു. മിസ്റ്റർ സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യരുടെ നിശ്ചയത്തിനു അദ്ദേഹം പറഞ്ഞ ന്യായങ്ങളെ ഒന്നും ഞാൻ എതിർക്കുന്നില്ല. അദ്ദേഹം പറഞ്ഞതിൽ ഞാൻ പിൻതാങ്ങുന്ന ഈ നിശ്ചയത്തെ സംബന്ധിക്കുന്നതായിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു അഭിപ്രായമേയുള്ളൂ. ഡയാക്കി ഫെയിലിയർ, ആയി എന്നാണ് അദ്ദേഹം പറഞ്ഞതു്. ഡയാക്കി ചിലേടത്തു പരാജയം ആയിട്ടുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതു ഡയാക്കിയുടെ ന്യൂനത കൊണ്ടായിരിക്കണമെന്നില്ല. ചില സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണവും പരാജയമായേക്കാം. ഡയാക്കി പരാജയമാകുന്നതു വിധത്തിൽ അതിനു സ്വതസിദ്ധമായ ന്യൂനതയില്ല. വർത്തമാനപത്രങ്ങളിൽ കാണുന്നതെല്ലാം അങ്ങിനെതന്നെ വിഴുങ്ങുവാൻ പോയാൽ അതു വലിയ വിഷമമാണു്. തത്വപരമായി നോക്കിയാൽ ഡയാക്കി ഫെയിലിയർ ആകുവാൻവഴിയില്ല. പരാജയം രേഖപ്പെടുന്നവരുടെ ദോഷം കൊണ്ടായിരിക്കും.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. ആർ. വിശ്വംഭരൻ: ഡയാക്കി എന്തിനു്? നല്ല ആളുകളെ പിടിച്ചാൽപോരെ?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: ഡയാക്കി പരാജയപ്പെടത്തക്കവണ്ണം അതിനു തത്വപരമായി ഉണ്ടെന്നു മി. സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യർ സ്ഥാപിച്ചിട്ടില്ല.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* It was given out by ex-Ministers who worked Dyarchy that the system was a failure.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: എക്സ്മിനിസ്റ്റർമാർ അല്ല ബ്രിട്ടനിലെ മിനിസ്റ്റർമാർതന്നെ പറഞ്ഞുവെച്ച അതു സ്വീകരിക്കുവാൻ ഞാൻ തയ്യാറില്ല. മിസ്റ്റർ സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യർതന്നെ പറഞ്ഞാലും ശരിയാണെങ്കിൽ സ്വീകരിക്കാൻ ഞാൻ ഒരുക്കമാണു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. വി. സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യർ: പിന്നെ ആരുപറഞ്ഞതു സ്വീകരിക്കും?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: മിസ്റ്റർ സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യർ തത്വം പറഞ്ഞാൽ സ്വീകരിക്കാം. നിങ്ങൾ പറഞ്ഞാൽ മതി. പിന്നെ ഒരു വഴക്കുമില്ല. ഡയാക്കി ശരിക്കു നടത്തിയാൽ യാതൊരു വിഷമവുമില്ല. കുഴപ്പം പിടിച്ച ആൾ വന്നാൽ അതു കുഴപ്പംതന്നെയാണു്. പൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദത്തെപ്പറ്റിയും പ്രൈംമിനിസ്റ്ററും മറ്റു മിനിസ്റ്റർമാരും തമ്മിൽ വഴക്കായാൽ എല്ലാംകുഴപ്പമാകുമല്ലൊ.

മിസ്റ്റർ വി. ജെ. മത്തായി: ആ സ്കീംതന്നെ തെറ്റാണെങ്കിലൊ?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: സ്കീം തെറ്റല്ല. ക്രമേണ പൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദഭരണത്തിൽ എത്താമെന്നാണു് പറയുന്നതു.

മിസ്റ്റർ എ. വി. മുത്തേടൻ: ലോകാവസാനത്തിൽ കിട്ടിയാൽ മതിയൊ?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: അതാണു പറയുവാൻ പോകുന്നതു്. പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിനു കൊച്ചിക്കാർ പ്രാപ്തരല്ലെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായക്കാരനല്ല ഞാൻ. ഈ കൊച്ചി നിയമസഭ തുടങ്ങിയതുമുതൽ ഇവിടെ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിനുവേണ്ടിയുള്ള വാദങ്ങളും ബഹളങ്ങളും നടത്തിത്തുടങ്ങിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഡെപ്യൂട്ടേഷൻ വഴിക്കും ഇറങ്ങിപ്പോക്കുവഴിക്കും മറ്റും വലിയ ബഹളം കൂട്ടിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അതിന്റെ കടലാസുകളെല്ലാം വേണമെങ്കിൽ ഇവിടെത്തന്നെയുണ്ടു്. കൊച്ചിക്കാർ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിനു പ്രാപ്തന്മാരാണെന്ന അറിയാം. പ്രാപ്തിമാത്രം പോര. ചോദിച്ചാൽമാത്രവും പോര. ഇതിൽ തരുംകൂടിയുണ്ടു്! തന്നെങ്കിലെ കിട്ടുകയുള്ളു. ഒന്നുകിൽ പിടിച്ചെടുക്കാൻ കരുത്തുവേണം. (ഹിയർ, ഹിയർ) അല്ലെങ്കിൽ തരുവാനുള്ള സൌജന്യം വേണം. ഈ രണ്ടു തത്വങ്ങളും മനസ്സിലാക്കിയതിനുശേഷം തരുവാനുള്ളവക്കു വല്ല വിഷമങ്ങളും ഉണ്ടോ എന്നു ഞങ്ങൾ ആലോചിച്ചു. ചോദിക്കൽ സ്വല്പം ചുരുക്കിയാൽ കിട്ടിയേക്കാമെന്നുതോന്നി. കഴിഞ്ഞ തവണ കുറെ ചോദിച്ചു. അങ്ങിനെ ഈ നിയമസഭയിൽ പാസാക്കിയ നിശ്ചയം ഗവർമ്മെൻറു സ്വീകരിച്ചതിന്റെ ഫലമാണു് ഇപ്പോഴുള്ള പരിഷ്കാരം. ഇനി രണ്ടുമൂന്നു ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെൻറുകളുംകൂടി തരിക എന്നാണു പറയുന്നതു്.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

മറുനാട്ടുരാജ്യങ്ങളിലെ സ്ഥിതികളും വെച്ചു ഞങ്ങൾ ആലോചിച്ചുനോക്കി. ഏതാനും ഏക്കർ സ്ഥലമുള്ള ആൻഡു് എന്നു സ്ഥലത്തുമാത്രം ഭരണപരിഷ്കാരം നടപ്പിലുണ്ടു്. ബാക്കി ഇതുപോലുള്ള സ്ഥലങ്ങളിലൊന്നും കൊടുക്കുന്നില്ല. അവിടങ്ങളിൽ കേമന്മാരായ രാജ്യതന്ത്രജ്ഞന്മാരുണ്ടു്. നല്ല രാജാക്കന്മാരും ഉണ്ടു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു തല്ക്കാലം മൂന്നു ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറുകൾ മാത്രം ചോദിക്കുക എന്നുനിശ്ചയിച്ചു. അതു കിട്ടുവാൻ ഇടയുണ്ടെന്നു തോന്നുന്നു. അതു കിട്ടിക്കഴിഞ്ഞാൽ പിന്നത്തെ ചോദ്യം പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിനായിരിക്കും. പൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദഭരണത്തിൽ നിയമവും ക്രമവും റവന്യൂവും ജനങ്ങളുടെ കയ്യിലാകണം. ഉത്തരവാദപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രിമാർ വന്നാലും ഇപ്പോഴുള്ളതിൽ കൂടുതൽ പണം കിട്ടുവാൻ സാദ്ധ്യമല്ല. ഇപ്പോൾതന്നെ ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറുകളിലേക്കു കിട്ടാവുന്ന പണം കിട്ടിവരുന്നുണ്ടു്. ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഗുണം ചെയ്യുവാനുള്ള ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറുകളാണതുകൾ. ജനങ്ങൾക്കു ഗുണം ചെയ്യുവാനുള്ള സെക്ഷനുകൾ ഇപ്പോൾ കിട്ടും അതും ഒന്നു പരീക്ഷിച്ചാൽ നന്നായിരിക്കും. പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം വേണമെന്നുള്ള റസല്യൂഷനു ശരിയായ മറുപടി ഗവൺമെൻറു പറയും. എന്നാൽ ഇതിനു മറുപടിപറയുവാൻ ഗവൺമെൻറു പറുങ്ങേണ്ടിവരും.

മിസ്റ്റർ വി. കെ. കൃഷ്ണൻകുട്ടി: കാരണമെന്താണു്?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: രാജ്യഭരണത്തിന്റെ സമ്പ്രദായം അറിയാവുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു്. പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം തരാത്തതിനു് എളുപ്പം സമാധാനം പറയാം. ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറുകൾകൂടി വിട്ടുതരണമെന്നുപാഞ്ഞതു് അതിന്റെ രണ്ടാമത്തെ പടിമാത്രമാണു്.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur)*: Why not one or two more?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തോടു യാതൊരു വഴക്കും ഞങ്ങൾക്കില്ല. ഇതു് ജനങ്ങൾക്കുവേണ്ടിയുള്ള പരിഷ്കാരമാണു്. ആ പരിഷ്കാരം നടപ്പിൽവരുത്തുവാനുള്ള പ്രായോഗികമായ വഴിയിൽകൂടി പോകുന്നു. അതു മനസ്സിലാക്കാതെ ചെയ്യുന്ന ആക്ഷേപം കേൾക്കുവാനുള്ള പരിചയം വേണ്ടിടത്തോളം ഞങ്ങൾക്കുണ്ടു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ വി. ജെ. മത്തായി: അധികം ചോദിച്ചാൽ ദോഷപ്പെട്ടുമെന്നാണൊ പറയുന്നതു്?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: ഇപ്പോൾ ഈ പരിഷ്കാരവും നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തി എന്നു വിചാരിക്കുക. ഇതു നിങ്ങൾ പാസാക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ഗവൺമെൻറിന്നു ധൈര്യമായും നടപ്പിലാക്കാം.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. വി. സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യർ: പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം വേണമെന്നുപറഞ്ഞാൽ അതു സ്വീകരിക്കുകയില്ലെന്നു പറയുന്ന നോൺ കോവാപ്പറേറു് ചെയ്യുന്ന വല്ല പാർട്ടിയും ഇവിടെയുണ്ടൊ?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ: പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം തരുവാൻ ഒരു ദിവസവും താമസിക്കുവാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നുപറയുന്ന മിസ്റ്റർ സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യരോ മറ്റോ അങ്ങിനെ ഉണ്ടായേക്കും. പെരിയാർ അണ പൊട്ടിയ മാതിരി ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്ന ആളുകൾ നോൺ കോവാപ്പറേറു് ചെയ്യുമോ എന്നാണു

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

സംശയിക്കുന്നതു്. ഇപ്പോൾഗവൺമെൻറു് ആലോചിക്കും, ജനപ്രതിനിധികൾ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം വേണമെന്നാവശ്യപ്പെടുമ്പോൾ ഇത്രമാത്രം കൊടുക്കുന്നതിൽ അവർ എങ്ങിനെ സ്വീകരിക്കുമെന്നു്. സാധാരണ നിലയിൽ നോക്കുമ്പോൾ അങ്ങിനെ സംശയിക്കുവാനിടയുണ്ടു്. എന്തായാലും സാമ്രാജ്യത്തിലേക്കു ഇതുകൊണ്ടു ഞങ്ങൾ തൃപ്തിപ്പെടുവാൻ തയ്യാറാണെന്നു ഈ നിയമസഭ ഗവൺമെൻറിനെ അറിയിക്കുന്നു. ഇതു് പ്രയോഗികമായ കാരണത്തുകൊണ്ടു" ഞാൻ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു.

The House rose for lunch at 1 p.m. and re-assembled at 2-30 p.m. with Mr. P. Govinda Menon, Panel Chairman, in the chair.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* Sir, I rise to support the motion of my Hon'ble Friend, Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar, in preference to the motion of Mr. T. K. Nayar. For, according to me, it appears that the motion for full responsible government has always been the very prince of our resolutions, the very kernel of our political aspirations, the acceptance or rejection of which is of vital importance to the country. A couple of years ago, during my last budget speech, Sir, I had occasion to compare the constitutional reforms inaugurated in Cochin to the first of the two stages which an accused before a criminal court had to undergo, the stage of bail and the stage of acquittal of which the grant of the first gives the accused only a transitory relief, while the grant of the second alone can afford a final liberation. I think, it was an assurance of this final liberation that was contained in the statement made by the Diwan in the course of the discussion of a resolution moved by Mr. Ayyappan requesting the Government to give a declaration of the constitutional goal of Cochin. Even as the Diwan said on that day that the Cochin Government had no idea to throw doubts and suspicions on the statement made by Earl of Winterton as the representative of His Majesty regarding the freedom of native State Rulers to introduce responsible government in their States. I think it would be unwise on the part of this House to question the validity of the statement made by the Diwan as the representative of His Highness the Maharaja, a statement which we take to mean as a declaration of the political and constitutional goal of Cochin as the progressive realisation of responsible government. When on that day the Diwan said that if this tender flower of partial responsible government now granted to you is properly nursed and protected from the attacks of hurricanes, certainly a day will come when this tender flower will burst forth into a fruit, the fruit of full responsible government which could be enjoyed by all, it was at once a reminder of our duties as well as our reward. Now that for the last 2½ years we have fulfilled our duty in as responsible a manner as we can,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

and as the cause demands, we come and claim our reward. And I say it is not open for the Government now to tell us, "You can go home, there is no reward for you," nor should the Government say, "wait on and you will have your reward." For whatever be the merits or demerits of dyarchy, as long as the duality of powers on which our constitution depends, it is impossible to conceive of the success of that constitution independent of the personalities involved in the administration. As has been rightly pointed out by my Hon'ble Friend Mr. Ayyappan, the success of dyarchy depends on the persons and whatever be the extent of cordiality between them, the transferred and the reserved half, whatever be the protection extended to the transferred half by the Diwan who is the very father of the constitution, the fact remains that Diwans come and go but the constitution remains. The fact remains that the success of this constitution will depend upon the changing minds of the changing Diwans and we say that the time has come when we should be free from the position that we should depend upon the fluctuating mentalities of administrators. Viewed in this sense, dyarchy is an inevitable evil between a form of absolute irresponsible government and full responsible government. The earlier that period of transition is closed the better it is for the country. We say, Sir, that so far as the constitutional progress in Cochin is concerned, we have waited sufficiently long. We have seen the times when in the 16th and the 17th centuries the Rulers of Cochin and their policies were being guided by popular assemblies which used to effectively control the administration of the State, though not in the form of the modern Legislative Council. We have also transgressed the darkest era in the political history of Cochin when, after the 17th century, for 2½ centuries, the people of the State were kept out of touch of the administration of the State. It was purely a matter of the Diwan assisted by a few officials. We had also occasion to pass through the history of modern Cochin when Cochin has a Legislative Council which, though responsive was not responsible, and which could afford to be irresponsible and at the same time pretend to be responsive. We, Sir, had also the unique fortune, 2½ years ago of being given admission to the land of dyarchy, into the land of partial responsible government, by the passing of the Government of Cochin Act. I should say that considering the bold step taken by the Cochin Government in passing the Government of Cochin Act which, for the first time in the history of the premier native States of India, accepted the principle of responsibility in the administration is certainly a landmark in the history of native States. But we say, Sir, the extent of responsibility granted to us by the Government of Cochin Act falls too short of our legitimate

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

political aspirations. What are the powers which this House now enjoys? What is the extent of the responsibility we have got? I wish to make it clear that my arguments for full responsible government are not based upon the practicability or impracticability, the merits or demerits of dyarchy but on the simple point that this House stands to claim the full element of responsibility to which it is naturally entitled. Sir, out of the total expenditure of the State nearly 40 per cent is kept out of the entire control of this House by way of non-votable items. What is the position with regard to the remaing 60 per cent? Has this House any absolute control over the remaining 60 per cent which is said to be votable items? I say, this House does not get the guarantee of our decision being upheld by the Government even with regard to the votable items, because, according to the Government of Cochin Act, there still remains a power for restoration by the Government. And what is our power with regard to legislation? There have been several unhappy instances where even those legislations sponsored by the Government have been withdrawn and sometimes attempted to be carried or dropped by threats issued to the legislators by members of the treasury bench. And in the case of non-official bills after all the vicissitudes, travails and troubles of getting them passed. They do not go from this House in a sense of insecurity of coming back as law, because there remains with His Highness the option to give or not to give assent to them.

Fortunately or unfortunately, we are blessed with a responsible Minister. It is also a fact, whether his powers are limited or not, either by express mention in the constitution or by healthy parliamentary conventions created in this House or in other Parliaments, that the Minister is at the mercy of the House to a very large extent. But he who is supposed to be the Leader of the House is today followed by 12 gigantic friends sitting opposite—I mean the other members of the treasury bench—who can still afford to cast their cynical glances upon our observations because this House does not enjoy the power of controlling them, either with regard to the salary or with regard to anything else. I am perfectly sure that though the present Diwan by chance happens to occupy that irresponsible office of the Diwan, those relics of democracy to which he had been betrothed some time ago will still linger in his mind and will induce him to agree with us in thinking that we long for a day when we can look at the treasury bench with a sense of security that our representations will be respected, that our efforts will not be castigated by them as coming from a quarter which they could well afford to ignore. We certainly believe, Sir, that these forcible arguments which have been advanced from time

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

immemorial by the popular representatives in Cochin have now come to a stage when they ought to be respected, a stage when the Government can no more say, we are not entitled to it at present, or that we should wait till eternity. We say that unless the Government cannot adapt itself to the changing times a situation might come, who knows, when even in spite of the peaceful and cultured habits of the citizens of the State, they will reach the breaking point, unless according to the changing tides, vessels of a more adaptable character are made so that they don't perish in the ocean. In such tides of political ocean, Sir, we demand that we should get full responsible government. We say that we have waited for long. We say that for the last 2½ years you have tried us in the land of dyarchy. You have tried us by giving us a chance for conducting responsible government through one Minister. Has the Government ever said till now that the Government conducted according to the reforms by the popular representatives, with the help, guidance and advice of this House has been conducted in an irresponsible manner? Has the Government a case that for the last 2½ years the constitution granted to Cochin, the extent of responsibility granted to Cochin has been abused by the public representatives to such an extent that they cannot claim it any more?

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* There is very little power to be abused.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* I go further and say that not only the Government has no case of that sort but the Government on several occasions have admitted that the Government run according to the new constitution has been run in a satisfactory and responsible manner. If, on the other hand, the Government has a case that the responsibility has not been properly discharged, I go further and challenge them to take away the reforms. If the Government is convinced that we have not discharged our duties properly, it was the duty of the Government to warn us of the irresponsibilities and to take away the reforms granted to us with a view to safeguard public interests. That being not done, Sir, we deem it as an admitted certificate granted by the Government to us that we have discharged our responsibilities properly.. This discharge of the responsibilities properly entitles us for our further claims. It has unfortunately happened on the floor of this House that in making such an important demand a division of view has occurred between one political party and another. It has so happened that when claims for reforms are being made those who make the claims according to their honest convictions and consistent with political principles, have been misunderstood and they have even been misinterpreted to mean

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

an attempt in torpedoing the resolution of Mr. T. K. Nayar. I wish to clear this misunderstanding. I wish to say that we are perfectly justified in placing before the Government our demands in accordance with our convictions and our political ideals. I go further and say that we will be doing a wrong thing if we fight shy of presenting our demands as our convictions and political ideals dictate to us. Do not fight shy. Don't give it a colour which it does not deserve and bring it to a lower level. You do not know what all things you will get. Now, Sir, what is the position of the mover of the other resolution? They have no case that we cannot demand full responsible government. With due respect to the ingenious arguments advanced by my friend Mr. Ayyappan in his own characteristic fashion which sometimes make mountains out of moles and dwindles mountains into moles, I regret I cannot subscribe to them, because they do not disclose any acceptable reasons as distinct from ours. There is no difference with regard to the conviction of that political party as to the fact that Cochinites are entitled to full responsible government. There is no case that the Cochin Government is now free to grant full responsible government. There is no such case at all. If you have a case that His Highness the Maharaja of Cochin is so controlled by paramount power, that His Highness could not enjoy the power of granting us this demand which we place before His Highness the Maharaja,then I can understand that argument. But the Government says they have none. Therefore, as long as the grantor is in a position to give and the grantee is sufficiently qualified to demand and receive, then I am only surprised to hear why that demand could not be made to the full. When, therefore, the grantor has no objection in giving and the grantee is fully qualified to receive why should you go before the Government and instead of claiming Rs. 100 claim only Rs. 25, I cannot understand. I can well understand a case where a grant is adjusted to the demand, but I can seldom understand the case where demand is adjusted to the grant. I can well understand Mr. T. K. Nayar if the Government says: "Well, here is a Government which places before you a particular kind of constitution which gives you partial responsible government over three departments. It is a challenge before you. Are you prepared to accept the present constitution and the elements of partial responsibility which we are prepared to grant you? If you are not prepared we are not going to give you even this; we are going, to refuse the whole thing." I can understand that sense of compromise if such a situation is presented to us by the Government. Is there such a case now? Has the Government now come before you presenting a partial responsible government before you and compelling you to accept that constitution

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

or to lose the whole claim for partial responsible government? So that the question is simply this. You are adjusting the demand imagining without foundation the nature of the grant, imagining the limitations of the grant, imagining the mentality of the grantor, without yourself any data for your limitations. I ask my friend Mr. T. K. Nayar now, here is a resolution before the House which claims three departments. Does Mr. T. K. Nayar know that the Government is not inclined to grant you more than three departments? How do you know? How are you going to imagine the inclination of the Government which you do not know. If the Government which is reputed to be responsive and which has realised the value of graceful concessions so far, is inclined, we do not know whether or not, to grant you 4 departments, here is a resolution framed by the non-official members of the legislature demanding only three departments leading the Government into perplexity. If that be the case, if the Government is prepared to grant you more responsibility than you demand, will it not be doing an act of injustice to the country if you limit your demand? Will you not be adopting a suicidal policy to the constitutional progress of Cochin if you limit your demands without consultation, without any idea of the mentality of the Government, without the knowledge that the Government is prepared to give you more or less? Sir, I am reminded of Browning's lines to the effect that "What is man's life worth if his grasp does not exceed his reach?" Will any political party in Cochin which is supposed to implement the constitutional and political aspirations of the State pour cold water on them by placing a cheque for part-payment? Sir, we refuse to agree with you. You may call us idealists, you may call us youngsters and you may call yourselves practical politicians. But, we believe in the necessity of presenting before the Government the case of the country. We believe that is the duty of this House to fight for all the rights for which the country stands. Whether you get less or you get full is a question which we will wait and see. We refuse to believe in the principle of limiting your demands without proper justification. What is the harm to the country? Has there been any case where this legislature can honestly say that those who sit on the Treasury bench are so responsive to your voice that a resolution which has been once passed with unanimous voice of this House has never been refused by the Treasury bench? Can any member of this House say that where you have been limiting your demands reading the limitations of the Government—and if you have not been reading those limitations, I believe, Mr. T. K. Nayar would have agreed with me in many of these resolutions—and if you have instances when the Government have rejected such resolutions, and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

they are in plenty—I ask you, sir, how are you justified now in thinking that Government will take a particular attitude in this matter. Is there a case of compromise or ejection placed before you by the Government? Here is a case of crying before the father or fighting against the father. There are only two methods, according to me. There are children who cry before their father and make their demands and cry to such an extent until the father will be completely compelled to give his son what he demands. Or, there is a case where people agitate to such an extent, that you wrest political power from the authorities. In either case the demand should be for the whole. If the child cries for the whole, the father gives you at least a part. If you decide to agitate, the trouble for full responsible government and partial responsible government are the same.

For these reasons, Sir, whether with regard to political aspirations, whether with regard to the justice of the cause, whether with regard to our qualifications for claiming responsible government, I believe, it is suicidal to the progress of the country to sponsor a resolution for partial responsible government which would limit our demand and place the Government in a better position. In this view, Sir, I support the resolution and I believe that the members of this House, whether they belong to political parties or not, will keep an open mind in examining the pros and cons and thus discharge their duties in the best interests of the country.

*__Mr. L. M. Pylee__ *(Latin Christians-Ernakulam):* Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting this resolution, because it is tantamount to my resolution. My resolution is that full responsible government should be introduced in the State with the beginning of the next Legislative Council. At the time of tabling this resolution there was no thought that the Council will be extended. Now, in the present situation, therefore, my resolution is the same as that introduced by Mr. Subramania Ayyar. I am glad that the most progressive resolution which has come up for the consideration of this House, namely, the demand for full responsible government has come from the Progressive Party and therefore the Progressive Party has justified itself in their assumption of that name "Progressive Party." Hitherto I was doubtful about their progressive aims. Now I am satisfied. The resolution is only one relating to that policy which was inaugurated by the Government of His Highness the Maharaja when His Highness the Maharaja was installed to the *Musnad* in 1932. The progressive policy which has been enunciated then moved rapidly and the last land-mark of it was that historic and epoch-making pronouncement made by His Highness on the 76th birthday of His Highness. That pronouncement is a land-mark in

*Speech not corrected by the hon'ble member

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the history of India, from where we began for the first time to practise the elements of responsible government in the Cochin State. Sir, I do not go into details. These details are becoming rather matters of common knowledge. The constitution inaugurated about 2½ years ago has got a retrograde element which I see. Even in the present constitution there is a retrograde element which I wish to bring to the notice of this House. My friend, Mr. Subramania Ayyar, was saying about the bulkiness of the nominated bloc. He also referred to the condition in some other States. May I bring to the notice of this House that in the Provincial Government out of 45 members, there were only 15 nominated members. Here, out of 58 members who sit in this House we have got a nominated bloc of 20 members. That is the retrograde step I mentioned above. It is a little more than 1/3 of the total number of members. Therefore, even in the Constitution which was so liberally granted, we find a slightly retrograde step.

Sir, let us now see the words in which His Highness expressed his desire to associate the public more and more with the administration of the State. May I crave the indulgence of this House to read out the passage of His Highness' Proclamation. We can never be tired of the words of His Highness. "Having been impressed by the genuine interest evinced by the Members of the Legislative Council I have decided that steps are now to be taken to associate my pepole directly with the administration of my Government and make the Legislative Council responsible in a more effective manner for the administration of the several nation-building Departments" and so on. I should think this is the *Magna Carta* of the Cochin State. Now what is it that we are asking for? We are simply asking for that announcement made by His Highness and nothing more. We are not going against the spirit of that announcement. His Highness felt confident in His Highness' subjects that certain departments could be transferred to them. Ultimately the whole power could be transferred. We are only asking for that, for the realisation of the goal and nothing more. Sir, what is the difficulty in this I cannot understand. Always to my mind, the difficulty is this, namely that reluctance by the holders of authority to transfer the authority which are being enjoyed for ages. To transfer those powers to other agencies is the only difficulty. Are we not fit for full responsible government? Surely we are fit for it. How? Look at the educational advancement of the State. Can we see that more advanced democratic forms of Government are being introduced in other parts of India which lag behind our State in the matter of education? We are much advanced in all respects than any other Indian State. Our political

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

consciousness has also developed to a great extent. There is a Progressive party; there is a progressive Cochin. Sir, my friend Mr. Ayyappan referred to the difficulties which the grantor of the powers may have. I refuse to believe him. I would have believed him, if he had made plain what the difficulties are. Perhaps it may be the existence of the old plea, the existence of treaty obligations. So far as we are concerned, I am sure, there is a treaty of 1791 and there is also a treaty of 1809. Subsequently, there is another agreement in regard to the Harbour and the Railway. I cannot understand how they are going to stand in the way of responsible government. I agree, Sir, that there was a time when it was thought that treaty rights and obligations and the conditions and provisions therein stood in the way. That time is gone and a new policy has come into existence. Even the theory of the treaty obligations was vehemently upheld in the Butler Committee Report. Even that has undergone vital changes and its importance has dwindled considerably. The Earl of Winterton's statement in the House of Parliament was accepted at its face value by the Diwan President in the discussions of this House. As far back as 13th February 1936 the Diwan had expressed apprehensions on this score. Of course, I was not a member of this House at that time. I recollect that he put forward this, namely, the existence of treaty rights and obligations and the relations with the Paramount Power, but at the same time he said that he was not throwing the plea as an obstacle in the way of granting responsible government. He was only pointing out the difficulties. That being the case, what is the difficulty I cannot understand. This theory of treaties and obligations has become an exploded theory; it has become some sort of myth. This is certainly one of the aspects of the question which I want to bring to the notice of this House.

Sir, then we are not asking for it in a spirit of agitation. I am sorry my friend Mr. Devassy said that a time will come when—I do not envisage such time—if the necessary powers are not given in full, the whole population will rise up. No such a thing we can expect in the near future. We are loyal to His Highness.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* I want only full responsible government under the aegis of His Highness the Maharaja.

Mr. L. M. Pylee *(Latin Christians-Ernakulam):* If full responsible government under the aegis of His Highness is to be given, it must be the lookout of the Government.

Anyway, the demand is not put forward in a spirit of agitation, so far as I am concerned. There is no such thing. It is solicitous.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

I am not putting it forward with a suggestion, with a plea that if it is not granted, we will take up something else. I am not going to be disloyal.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon *(Chittur-Rural):* Agitations are not disloyal.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* My Hon'ble Friend Mr. Pylee, don't attribute it to my statement. I said only about constitutional agitation. Nothing disloyal.

Mr. L. M. Pylee *(Latin Christians-Ernakulam):* I imagine I heard 'a breaking point' or something like that.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam):* No imagination. It is a fact that he said.

Mr. L. M. Pylee *(Latin Christians, Ernakulam):* Therefore, I should think that in the most respectable spirit, loyal spirit, this demand is put forward. Therefore, I would request the Members of this House to support this resolution, which is asking full responsible government. The undesirability of asking the control of a few departments has been dealt with by my friend, Mr. Devassy. Let us not ask for the small things. Let us not have this form of dyarchy. Dyarchy, when it is getting vanished from British India, when it is denounced in British India, why should we have it for an unduly long time?

Sir, dyarchy, after all, is a temporary expedient. That is all. It must go. If it is kept long, it will be just like milk. In this matter, Sir, I am glad that on various occasions the Diwan President himself has expressed his sympathies. He clearly expressed that the goal of our constitutional development will be the grant of full responsible government, not only here, but in all the native States. Therefore when he is so sympathetic towards this, let us hope that the request put forward in this resolution will be granted by the Government without delay as soon as possible, so that the aspirations of the people might be satisfied and Cochin might remain a model to other native States. We have got an advantage in this respect. Cochin is a small State. Therefore these constitutional experiments are easier to be made in Cochin than in bigger States. Therefore, the smallness of our State is an advantage. Let us have a constitution where full power is enjoyed by the Members of the Legislature and where the executive is responsible to the Legislature. Let us have something of that on a small scale. Let us follow that model and let the time come when as Tennyson has said about British Constitution broadening from precedent to precedent. Let us be given a chance

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

also and let Cochin, which has inaugurated the current of responsible government in native States, go on with that work and see the happy consummation as early as possible. Without taking any more time of this House, I heartily support the resolution of Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* Sir, I find that there is a lot of misapprehension prevailing in the minds of several Members. In the first place it is not correct to say that somebody has refused responsible government. His Highness's Proclamation clearly indicates that His Highness is prepared to take his people more and more into association with His Highness. The Diwan has proclaimed, in answer to Mr. Ayyappan's anology that this flower of reforms may wither away, that this flower will bring out a luscious fruit for all to eat. Who is denying responsible government? It must be His Highness as advised by the Diwan. That seems to be a misapprehension. I, therefore, think that if anybody pleads for a moment that there is somebody standing in the way of granting responsible government, it is a mistake.

The second misapprehension proceeds from Mr. Ayyappan. Mr. Ayyappan who has always been agitating for the fullest responsible government, when he was little younger, now entertains an apprehension that he might offend somebody if he asked for more. Apart from that, to me it appears that nobody will feel aggrieved, neither the Diwan nor His Highness. Because it has been proclaimed over and over again that they want to take people into closer association with the Government. Mr. Devassy on his part is under the misapprehension, that the resolution of Mr. T. K. Nayar goes against the resolution of Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar, I don't think so. I will vote for both the resolutions. There is misapprehension No. 3. Mr. T. K. Nayar wants responsible government so far as three departments are concerned, but Mr. Subramania Ayyar wants undiluted responsible government. Why not vote for both? As far as I am concerned I am in entire agreement with the younger section of the House in demanding full, free and undiluted responsible government and in doing so, I am only obeying my nature. Every child born of woman, as soon as it is capable of looking after itself, wants to govern itself. Therefore, it is certainly unborn in us that we want freedom, untramelled freedom, the power to govern ourselves and if that is granted, the rest disappears. There is absolutely no wonder in the people asking for fuller association in the government of the people. And democracy has been defined as a government of the people for the people by the people. Therefore, it is only obeying your own nature when you

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

demand it. I only say it is in our nature to ask for full freedom in governing oneself. We contribute all the taxes. We wish to govern ourselves. If we can govern ourselves for 6 hours in the day I suppose it necessarily follows that we are able to govern ourselves for 24 hours. If 7 departments come under the control of the Minister, why not the other Departments also follow? Why should Mr. T. K. Nayar object to that argument? Now, the point is this. When Mr. T. K. Nayar says that the revenue realizing departments need not be transferred over to the people the inherent fallacy is that there will then be no reponsible government at all, because the financial side of the Government could starve the development side of the Government. The Minister for Rural Development is certainly dependant and tied down to the strings of the Finance Member. Unless the Finance Member transfers to him money he will be like a river without water. So, the Hon'ble Minister has to be waiting at the doors of the Finance Member asking to give him some money. Can you say it is self-government? Can you say that it is any responsible government? As a further step towards complete responsible government, to place certain departments under the control of the Minister is Mr. T. K. Nayar's resolution. The first step in the direction of responsible government is to have the wherewithal to carry on. Now the only departments that are proposed to be transferred are those of Education, Medicine and Public Works. All the three are money eating departments and no department can go without money. Therefore, if the reserved side of the Government wants to starve these departments and make the Minister unpopular or make his powers nugatory, then they have only to refuse money.

If I may go a step further I really object to the presence of any of the nominated member in this House. The position is this. We are 58 in this House. Out of this 20 are nominated by the Government. The present position is that among the elected members there could not be unanimity of views. We find there are 3 parties in this House. And now there are four parties. You cannot expect all the four parties to agree on a proposition. If one party goes along with the 20 members we find that every resolution brought forward by the non-official side becomes useless. We are finding it as a matter of fact. Therefore simply to say that in the present situation of the House certain Departments should be transferred to the Minister is practically meaningless. That is another reason why I support the resolution of Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar.

Then there are also great dangers which may possibly arise out of the present situation. The first difficulty is the possibility of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

dead-locks, between the reserved half and the transferred half of the Government, between the ministerial side of the block and the official block. In the reformed constitution there is no provision whatever laid down for such an eventuality, except for the Minister to resign. This is only one of the dangers. So, as regards the question as to whether we will misuse the opportunities that may be given to us I have absolutely no hesitation in saying that the whole course of conduct of the Cochin Legislative Council and of the Cochin public are evidence to the contrary. As far as the Minister is concerned he has made a success of the powers vested in him and the whole non-official bloc is glad that this can be put forward as a basis for our demand for responsible government. I daresay that no aspersions can be cast that the House has behaved irresponsibly. It has been a most responsible House understanding things and voting and non-voting things according to the necessity of the case, and as regards the public of Cochin, I daresay that they, as proved by statistics, are the most educated section in India. There will be absolutely no harm in leaving to the people of Cochin full responsible government. There are the arguments why we say we deserve it. There is no argument for refusing this demand.

Now I want to dwell for a moment upon certain pre-requisites of any grant of responsible government. In the first place, all the communal electorates must disappear. As at present this House may be a consultative body; but if the full responsible government is given, naturally, every member has the power to decide once and for all for the whole of Cochin. I want every section of the people to influence every other section of the people. Naturally I want every member elected to this House to be fully responsible to the people as a whole instead of being responsible to communities. Therefore, firstly the communal electorates must go and secondly adult franchise must certainly be given. Otherwise there is no meaning in saying there is responsible government. If only you associate a certain section of the people, the term full responsible government has to be taken away from this resolution. Full responsible government means giving complete responsibility to the people as a whole, and not to a section of the people. Therefore, these are the two important pre-requisites to the grant of responsible government.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* If you insist upon it, will you be able to get responsible government?

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* I, for one, am not concerned with the question whether you will get it or not. I am concerned only with the principle underlying the question. As I said, we must ask for it. We must remove the obstacles. As I said before, there

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

should be no Government bloc in this House. Instead of the Government bloc there must be a bloc headed by the Ministers and consisting of his followers and supporters. That should be the Government bloc. If this House is to be so constituted, there will be only ministers and their party and the opposition. Now where is the opposition? How many parties are there in the House to-day? We see the Government party, the ministerialist party or the Cochin Congress party, the Cochin State Congress party and the Progressive party. There are now four well-defined parties.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* The nominated bloc?

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* The nominated bloc also, if you call it another party.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Independents?

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* Yes, then independents. Naturally there will be independents all over the world.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* And Mathai's party!

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* Mathai is the only true independent. Anyhow more members have now found my wisdom and have followed me. The present position of the Council is therefore a most unenviable one and I say, you should not give responsible government to such a House. That is my point. If the non-official section is unable to make its voice felt absolutely, then there is no meaning in saying, responsible government. Also I say, if there are members representing communal electorates, then also there is no meaning in responsible government. Likewise there is no meaning in responsible government unless all the people are taken into association with the government of the country. Therefore, I am absolutely for full free responsible government based on unfettered democratic principles. In the history of the evolution of mankind, even after trials and trials, from the confederacy of Hellas onwards, in spite of Hitlers and Mussolinis, we find that history teaches us that democracy is the most perfect government that can possibly be thought of in a world of imperfections.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur)*: Sir, I have great pleasure in opposing both the resolutions that are now placed before the House *(Laughter)*. I am opposing them mainly on two grounds. One is a technical objection that such a resolution cannot be moved in this House. Secondly, resolutions of this sort are absolutely futile because we already have responsible government *(Laughter)*. I will deal with the first aspect of the question first.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. R. Viswambharan *(Ezhuvas-Talappalli):* It has been admitted by the President.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* Yes, but what of that? Because it has been admitted by the President is no reason why I should not raise any objection as to whether the resolution is technically sound or not. My objection to the resolutions on the technical ground is this. Under the Act this Council is not competent to move any resolution affecting or dealing with any of the provisions of the Act.

Then, in my view, this Act contemplates only the appointment of one Minister. The very wording of Mr. T. K. Nayar's resolution takes into account the appointment of a number of ministers, which, in my view, is something which will affect the provisions of the Government of Cochin Act. And as such we, as responsible members of a responsible legislature, ought to think twice before we ourselves go against the law under which we derive our existence. *(Laughter).* In spite of the general laughter, I shall refer to the relevant section in the Act to prove my case. The particular section to which I would like to draw the attention of the House is section 24, sub-section (2) which reads thus: "There shall not be introduced into or moved in the Legislative Council, any Bill or Amendment or Motion or Resolution or Interpellation or other proceedings relating to or affecting the following matters:" Here a number of items are mentioned and finally it is said. "(*m*) the provisions of the Act." And the previous sections will clearly show that when His Highness the Maharaja was pleased to inaugurate the reforms and when he was pleased to pass this Act, he had in view only the appointment of one Minister and there is absolutely no scope for the appointment of a number of ministers.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* Why could not all the departments be given to one Minister?

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* I have absolutely no objection. But that is not what is contemplated in the resolution. Therefore, my submission to this House is that we ought not to indulge in elaborate discussions—I might even say with the permission of the Chair, diffused discussions—about matters which we are not competent to discuss, thereby wasting our energy and time. His Highness has contemplated only one Minister under the Act. In this connection it will be interesting to refer to the corresponding provision in the British Act. Section 52 of the Government of India Act contemplates the appointment of a number of Ministers. The wording used there is "Ministers" and not "Minister", as is the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

case in our Act. So, I am justified in my contention that no additional ministers are contemplated under our Act. Only one Minister can be appointed and consequently we, who are supposed by the public to be framing and fashioning and re-fashioning the laws of the country, should not be willing parties to a violation of our own title deed. The very same argument applies to the resolution moved by the Hon'ble Friend, Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar.

Then, coming to the second aspect of the question, to my mind, this is much more important. Do we really want a resolution of this sort to secure a *fait accompli*? *(Laughter)*. Have we not already got responsible government? *(Loud laughter)*. That is the next question. How exactly are the powers of the Council restricted now? We have got a Council elected upon the basis of a very liberal franchise. It is only in the matter of voting the pay of the heads of departments that our powers are restricted. In all other matters, we can vote, we can decide and we do decide. The only difficulty comes in when the Government considers that some of our decisions are not very wise and then, they have got the power of certification. But I ask, is there any democratic Government anywhere in the world where this power is not reserved in the Constitution to some higher authority or other? Under the British Constitution, the King of England has got the power of over-riding the decisions of the House of Commons; in the American Constitution it exists; it exists in the French Constitution also. But, by a series of conventions and precedents built up through centuries, this power may not be used at all; and by constant dis-use it might have become atrophied. But the power exists nonetheless. So what we ought to do in the matter of developing responsible government here is not by clamouring for responsible government, but by bringing forward only such measures in this Council as will be sufficiently reasonable that no self-respecting Government would dare to oppose them *(Laughter)*. In this connection it will be very interesting to refer to a certain action of the Government where they have not only shown responsiveness but responsibility also. I am referring to the extension of the Council *(Laughter)*. This is a very important matter. In all seriousness I say that there is absolutely no necessity at all hereafter to criticise the Government as being irresponsible *(Laughter)*. The accredited representatives of the people put forward definite and valid reasons for the extension. And the Government was perfectly right in accepting that recommendation quite wisely and properly. I must admit most sincerely that this one action of the Government is sufficient to demolish for ever the foundation on which vehement attacks were being made on the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Government as being irresponsible in not accepting the recommendations made by this House. Therefore, I am not prepared for a moment to concede that we have not got responsible government even now. Granting for argument's sake that we have not got responsible government, what exactly should we do in this matter? I say that we should not infringe the provisions of the Act if we want to get more powers. We, of all persons should not do it. We are the framers of the law. If we do that we will be cutting a very poor show before the eyes of the public. The proper procedure is by petitioning the Government, outside the four walls of the Council.

Then there is another difficulty too if responsible government, as suggested in Mr. T. K. Nayar's resolution, is brought into effect. Now we get a 50,000 rupees per annum Dewan and 10,000 rupees per annum Minister. Suppose there are two or three more ministers. What will be the position? The resolution moved by Mr. Nayar is very catholic and wide. For these three departments we will have three more ministers. The next step will be a few more ministers. So that ultimately there will be only ministers and very few people for the ministers to rule *(Loud laughter)*. We must consider what exactly are the financial implications of having a number of ministers.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Cut down the salary.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* You have not got anything of that sort in the resolution. For a small State where the administration can be carried on by a handful of people.....

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* How many, in your estimation, is the handful?

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* It all depends upon the type of persons. Suppose we get persons like you, only one will be enough *(Loud and continued laughter)*.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* For types like you?

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* Many will be necessary. So, what I say is, these are real difficulties in the way of increasing the number of ministers. There are fundamental and radical objections as regards the resolution moved by my friend Mr. T. K. Nayar. I think I have tried to make my objections as clear as possible to this House so that the House may come to a decision dispassionately and disinterestedly.

One more word and I am done. My Hon'ble Friend Mr. Mathai, for whom I have great esteem, has been saying that every child of a goat wants independence. I say any son of an ass *(Laughter)* will realise that we have got responsible government here *(Continued*

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

laughter). Why should we hanker after a thing we have already got and waste the time of the Council? So, my submission to this House is that this should be viewed in its proper light and not be discussed from the stand-point of the impending elections.

Mr. K. R. Viswambharan *(Ezhuvas-Talappalli):* Not impending.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* Elections may possibly be postponed again. But I am saying that whether the elections come next year or a couple of years hence, the discussion on these resolutions should be on an academic basis and you should not at all be guided by vehement and effusive orations. I ask the House once again to throw out both these resolutions without any more of talk on the matter.

മിസ്റ്റർ സി. കെ. എസ്സ്. മണി: മിസ്റ്റർ പ്രസിഡണ്ട്, സർ, സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കോൺഗ്രസ് പാർട്ടിലീഡർ മിസ്റ്റർ നായർ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന പ്രമേയത്തെ ഞാൻ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു. കൊടുങ്ങല്ലൂർ മെമ്പർ പറയുകണ്ടായി, ഇതേ മാതിരിയുള്ള പ്രമേയങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റി ആലോചിക്കുവാൻ ഈ കൌൺസിലിന്നു അധികാരമില്ല എന്നു്. ഞാൻ പറയുന്നതു് നിങ്ങളാരും ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെപ്പറ്റി വാദിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല എന്നാണു്. ഭാരതത്തിലെ നാട്ടുരാജ്യങ്ങൾ മുഴുക്കെല്ലാം ഒരു മാതൃക കാണിച്ചുകൊടുത്തിട്ടുള്ള നമ്മുടെ മഹാരാജാവു് തിരുമനസ്സുകൊണ്ടും ദിവാൻജിയവർകളും അവർ ഏർപ്പെടുത്തിയിട്ടുള്ള ഭരണപരിഷ്കാരം പൂർത്തിയാക്കുകയില്ലെന്നു് കൊച്ചിയിലെ ഒരു വ്യക്തിക്കുപോലും വിശ്വസിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. അതുക്കു് പൂർണ്ണവിശ്വാസം നമുക്കുണ്ടെങ്കിലും മഹാരാജാവു് തിരുമനസ്സിലെ പരമാധികാരത്തിൽ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നതിൽ അബദ്ധമില്ല. എന്നാൽ മിസ്റ്റർ നായർ ഇവിടെ ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നതു് ഇപ്പോൾ നമുക്കനുവദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള പരിഷ്കാരത്തിൽനിന്നു ഒരു പ്രമോഷൻ മാത്രമാണു്. അദ്ദേഹം ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നതു് മൂന്നു പ്രധാന വകുപ്പുകൂടി ജനകീയ ഭരണത്തിനു് വിട്ടുകൊടുക്കണമെന്നാണു്. അതു ലഭിച്ചുകഴിഞ്ഞാൽ മറ്റുള്ള ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെണ്ടുകളും അതുപ്രകാരം വന്നുകൊള്ളും. മിസ്റ്റർ നായർ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിനു വാദിക്കാത്തതുകൊണ്ടു പുരോഗമന കക്ഷിക്കാർക്കും മറ്റു പലർക്കും ഇവിടെ അസുഖമുണ്ടെന്നു വെളിപ്പെട്ടുകഴിഞ്ഞു. കൊച്ചി നിയമസഭയുടെ ഉത്ഭവം മുതൽ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിനുവേണ്ടി വാദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള മിസ്റ്റർ നായരുടെ ഉദ്ദേശശുദ്ധിയെ കൊച്ചിലെ ജനങ്ങൾ മറക്കുന്നതല്ല. അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ആക്ഷേപം ചോദ്യം ചെയ്യുവാൻ സാധിക്കുന്നതുമല്ല. അദ്ദേഹം ഇവിടെ ഒരു പ്രായോഗികപദ്ധതി മാത്രമാണു കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ളതു്. എനിക്കു പൂർണ്ണവിശ്വാസമുണ്ടു്, നമ്മളാരും ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടില്ലെങ്കിലും ദിവാൻജിയവർകൾ തുടങ്ങിവെച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ഭരണപരിഷ്കാരത്തിന്റെ പൂർത്തീകരണത്തിനു അദ്ദേഹം മറ്റാരേയും അനുവദിക്കയില്ലെന്നു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു നമ്മുടെ ദിവാൻജി കൊച്ചിരാജ്യത്തിലെ അവസാനത്തെ ദിവാൻജിയായിരിക്കുമെന്നും ഞാൻ പരിപൂർണ്ണമായി വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു. ഈ പരമാർത്ഥം ഈ കൌൺസിലിലെ എല്ലാമെമ്പർമാർക്കും അറിയാമെന്നു് ഞാൻ കരുതുന്നു. ഞങ്ങൾ ചോദിച്ചു് ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം കിട്ടിയെന്നുള്ള കൃതാർത്ഥതക്കുവേണ്ടി മാത്രമാണു് ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിനുവേണ്ടി ഇവിടെ വാദിക്കുന്നതു്:

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. വി. സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യർ: നിങ്ങൾ എല്ലാ കൂട്ടായ്മയുടെയും യാണ് ഈ പ്രസംഗം ചെയ്യുന്നത്?

മിസ്റ്റർ സി. കെ. എസ്സ്. മണി: ഇനി ഞാൻ മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. വി. സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യരുടെ പ്രസംഗത്തെപ്പറ്റി രണ്ടുവാക്കു ഇവിടെ പറയാമെന്നു വിചാരിക്കുന്നു. അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ പ്രസംഗത്തിൽ ഇവിടെ നോമിനേറ്റഡ് മെമ്പേഴ്സ് എപ്പോഴും ഗവൺമെണ്ടഭാഗം അനുകൂലിച്ചാണ് നില്ക്കുന്നതെന്നും വോട്ടു ചെയ്യുന്നതെന്നും പറയുകയുണ്ടായി.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. വി. സുബ്രഹ്മണ്യയ്യർ: എന്നും നോമിനേറ്റഡ് മെമ്പേഴ്സ് അതുപ്രകാരം പ്രവൃത്തിച്ചുവെന്നല്ല പറഞ്ഞതു്. നോമിനേറ്റഡ് മെമ്പേഴ്സ് ആയാൽ അവർക്കു എപ്പോഴും ഗവൺമെണ്ടിനോടു ചേർന്നുനില്ക്കുവാൻ ഉത്സാഹമുണ്ടാകുമെന്നാണ് പറഞ്ഞതു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ സി. കെ. എസ്സ്. മണി: ഈ കൌൺസിലിന്റെ കഴിഞ്ഞ കാലങ്ങളിലെ പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങൾ നോക്കിയാൽ അദ്ദേഹം ഇപ്രകാരം ഒരു അഭിപ്രായം പറയുകയില്ലായിരുന്നു. ഇപ്രകാരമുള്ള ഒരു അഭിപ്രായം പറഞ്ഞതിൽ ഞാൻ വളരെ പരിതപിക്കുന്നു. പിന്നെ അദ്ദേഹം പറഞ്ഞതു് നോമിനേഷൻ സിസ്റ്റംതന്നെ തീരെ എടുത്തുകളയണമെന്നാണ്. നോമിനേഷൻ സമ്പ്രദായം കൊച്ചീരാജ്യത്തിൽ മാത്രമല്ല ഭാരതമൊട്ടുക്കു ജാതിവഴക്കു നിലനില്ക്കുന്നിടത്തോളം കാലം ന്യൂനപക്ഷ സമുദായങ്ങളെ പരിരക്ഷിക്കുവാൻവേണ്ടി സ്വീകരിക്കേണ്ടതു ഏറ്റവും അത്യാവശ്യമായിട്ടുള്ളതാണ്. അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ഇന്നലത്തെ പ്രസംഗത്തിൽ വർഗ്ഗീയവാദങ്ങളെല്ലാം കളയണമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞതായി ഞാൻ ഓർക്കുന്നു. ഭാരതത്തിലെ വർഗ്ഗീയവാദത്തിനു ഒരു സമാധാനം കണ്ടെത്തുന്നതുവരെ കൊച്ചിയിലും വർഗ്ഗീയവാദം നിലനില്ക്കും. ന്യൂനപക്ഷസമുദായങ്ങൾക്കു് ഭൂരിപക്ഷ സമുദായങ്ങളിൽനിന്നു ശരിയായ അനുകൂല്യങ്ങൾ ലഭിക്കുമോ എന്നു ഞാൻ സംശയിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു. ഒരു തിരഞ്ഞെടുപ്പിനു് നില്ക്കുവാൻ യാതൊരുവിധകഴിവുകളുമില്ലാത്ത ന്യൂനപക്ഷസമുദായങ്ങൾക്കു് നോമിനേഷൻ സമ്പ്രദായംകൊണ്ടല്ലാതെ രക്ഷയില്ലെന്നുള്ളതു് ഞാൻ ഇവിടെ വ്യക്തമാക്കിക്കൊണ്ടു മിസ്റ്റർ നായരുടെ പ്രമേയത്തെ പിന്താങ്ങിക്കൊള്ളുന്നു.

മിസ്റ്റർ വി. കെ. കുട്ടി: മിസ്റ്റർ പ്രസിഡണ്ടു്, സർ, കൊച്ചിൻ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കോൺഗ്രസ്പാർട്ടിലീഡർ മിസ്റ്റർ നായർ ഇവിടെ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള പ്രമേയത്തോടു ഞാനും അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു. എന്തുകൊണ്ടെന്നാൽ പ്രായോഗികവശങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റി ചിന്തിക്കുവാനും അനുഭവബോധ്യമായ സംഗതികളെ അനുകൂലിക്കുവാനുമുള്ള ബുദ്ധിയുള്ളവർക്കെല്ലാം അപ്രകാരം പ്രവൃത്തിക്കുവാനുള്ള ചുമതലയുണ്ടു്. ആ ചുമതലയെ മുൻനിറുത്തിക്കൊണ്ടു മാത്രമാണു ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നതു്. പൂർണ്ണമായ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം ഇന്ത്യയിൽ വേണമെന്നുള്ള മുറവിളി തുടങ്ങി വളരെ കാലമായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അതിന്റെ വാദം ഇപ്പോൾ വലിയൊരു വിഷമഘട്ടത്തിൽ എത്തിയിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നും എനിക്കറിയാം. ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ചില മെമ്പർമാർ ഇവിടെ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള പ്രമേയം ഏതാണ്ടു ആ ചുറുപാടുകളെ അടിസ്ഥാനപ്പെടുത്തിക്കൊണ്ടാണെന്നും എനിക്കറിയാം. എന്നാൽ ആ വാദത്തോടു പരിപൂർണ്ണമായി അനുകൂലിക്കുന്ന ഒരാളാണു ഞാൻ. കൊച്ചിയെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളം പ്രായോഗികമായ ഒരു പല്ലതി എടുക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായം കൊണ്ടാണു ഞാൻ ഇതിനോടു

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

യോജിക്കുന്നതെന്നു പ്രത്യേകം പ്രസ്താവിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു. കൊച്ചിയിൽ രണ്ടര ക്കൊല്ലമായി നടപ്പിലിരിക്കുന്ന മിനിസ്ട്രിഭരണം, അല്ലെങ്കിൽ ഉത്തരവാദി ത്വഭരണം തൃപ്തികരമായി പ്രവൃത്തിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു ഇപ്പോഴെങ്കിലും ഈ സഭ പൂ ർണ്ണമായി സമ്മതിച്ചതിൽ എനിക്കു വളരെ സന്തോഷമുണ്ടു്. ഈ ഭരണം തൃ പ്തികരമാണെന്നും, പ്രായോഗികമായിട്ടുള്ളതാണെന്നും ഇവിടെയുള്ള നോമി നേറെഡ്ഡ് മെമ്പർമാർ നേരത്തെ മനസ്സിലാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നുള്ളതു് ഇപ്പോഴെ ങ്കിലും നിങ്ങൾ സമ്മതിക്കുമെന്നു ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു. നോമിനേറെഡ്ഡ് മെമ്പർമാർ കേവലം ഒരു പാട്ടിതിരിച്ചുള്ള പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങളല്ല ഇവിടെ ചെയ്തി ട്ടുള്ളതെന്നു നിങ്ങൾ ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ ഓർമ്മിക്കുമെന്നു ഞാൻ വിചാരി ക്കുന്നു. രണ്ടു പാട്ടികളായി ഈ നിയമസഭയിൽ വന്നിട്ടുള്ള ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർമാർ ഇപ്പോൾ നാലഞ്ചു പാട്ടികളായി തിരിഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടു". നിങ്ങൾ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തെപ്പറ്റി ചിന്തിക്കുവാൻ തുടങ്ങിയകാലത്തു ഞങ്ങൾ അതിനുവേണ്ടി വാദിച്ചിരുന്നവരായിരുന്നുവെന്നുള്ളതു ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ ഞാൻ നിങ്ങളെ അറിയിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു. ഇവിടത്തെ മിനിസ്ട്രിഭരണം വി ജയകരമായി പ്രവൃത്തിക്കുവാൻ സംഗതി വന്നിട്ടുള്ളതു ഞങ്ങളുടെ ബുദ്ധിസാ മർത്ഥ്യംകൊണ്ടാണെന്നു ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട സാമാജികന്മാർ വെളിപ്പെടുത്തിത്ത ന്നതിൽ ഞാൻ തൊഴുകയ്യോടുകൂടി അവരോടു നന്ദിപറഞ്ഞുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

ഇനി നോമിനേഷൻ സിസ്റ്റത്തെപ്പറ്റിയാണു് എനിക്കു രണ്ടുവാക്കു പറ യുവാനുള്ളതു്. നോമിനേഷനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളം വോട്ടവകാശകമ്മി റി വന്നപ്പോൾ അനവധി വാദങ്ങൾ ഈ രാജ്യത്തുണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ചില സ മുദായങ്ങൾ അതായതു സമുദായങ്ങളിലെ വോട്ടുകൾ മാത്രംകൊണ്ടു നിയമസഭ യിൽ പ്രവേശിക്കുവാൻവേണ്ടി വാദിച്ചു. ചിലർ അതിനെ അനുകൂലിച്ചില്ല. അതിന്റെ ഫലമായി ആ കമ്മറിയുടെറിപ്പോർട്ടു വന്നപ്പോൾ മുസ്ലീമിങ്ങൾ ഒഴിച്ചു മറ്റുള്ളവരെല്ലാം അവരുടെ വാദത്തെ തങ്ങിനില്ക്കുകയാണു ചെയ്തിട്ടു ള്ളതു്. മുസ്ലീമിങ്ങളാകട്ടെ ആ സമ്പ്രദായമനുസരിച്ചു നമ്പർ വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചു കൌൺസിലിൽ പോകണമെന്നുള്ള ആശയക്കാരല്ലാതിരുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു അവരു ടെ അവകാശത്തിനു വേണ്ടിയുള്ള പ്രക്ഷോഭണങ്ങൾ നടത്തി. ഞങ്ങൾ അ തിനുവേണ്ടി ആത്മാർത്ഥമായി പരിശ്രമിച്ചു. ഞങ്ങളുടെ പ്രമേയങ്ങളും ഞ ങ്ങളുടെ വാദങ്ങളും യഥാർത്ഥമായിട്ടുള്ളതാണെന്നു ഗവർമ്മെണ്ടിൽനിന്നു മന സ്സിലാക്കിയതിന്റെ ഫലമായി ഞങ്ങളർഹിക്കുന്ന ഒരു സ്ഥാനം ഞങ്ങൾ കൈവശപ്പെടുത്തി. ഞാൻ ഒരു നോമിനേറെഡ്ഡ് മെമ്പരുടെ നിലയിൽ ഇവിടെ പ്രസംഗിക്കുന്നുവെന്നു നിങ്ങൾ ധരിക്കരുതു്. എനിക്കും നിങ്ങളോ ടൊപ്പം വരുവാനുള്ള നില ഉണ്ടെന്നു നിങ്ങൾ മനസ്സിലാക്കണം. നോമിനേ റെഡ്ഡ് സിസ്റ്റം കേവലം എടുത്തുകളയണമെന്നുള്ള വാദം വരുന്നപക്ഷം ഇ വിടെ അനേകം അംബേദ്കർമാരും ജിന്നമാരും ഉണ്ടാകുമെന്നിടയുണ്ടു്. നമ്മു ടെ രാജ്യത്തുള്ള സമുദായങ്ങൾ തമ്മിൽ വളരെ സൌഹാർദ്ദതയിലാണു് ക ഴിഞ്ഞുകൂടുന്നതു്. ഇപ്പോൾ പുലയ സമുദായത്തിനുവേണ്ടി ഗവർമ്മെണ്ടു ഒരു നോമിനേഷൻ കൊടുത്തുവരുന്നുണ്ടു്. നിങ്ങൾ വിചാരിക്കുന്നുണ്ടോ അതു നി റുത്തി അവർക്കു ഏലക്ഷൻ നിശ്ചയിച്ചാൽ നന്നായിരിക്കുമെന്നു്? അതുകൊ ണ്ടു സമുദായങ്ങളുടെ സാമ്പത്തികനിലകൂടി നോക്കണം. പാട്ടി സിസ്റ്റം ഇ വിടെ വർദ്ധിപ്പിയ്ക്കുവാൻ തുടങ്ങിയതോടുകൂടി സമുദായങ്ങളുടെയിടയിൽ പല വിധത്തിലുള്ള ഉന്നിത്തള്ളലുകൾ ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അങ്ങിനെ വരുമ്പോൾ സമുദായങ്ങൾ ആശിക്കുന്ന സ്ഥാനം ഈ കൌൺസിലിൽ കിട്ടുമോ എന്നു ബ ഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട സാമാജികന്മാരും പ്രത്യേകിച്ചു നോമിനേഷൻ എടുത്തുകളയണ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

മെന്ന വാദിച്ച മെമ്പർമാരും ആലോചിക്കണം. അതുകൊണ്ടാണ് നോമിനേഷൻ സിസ്റ്റം നിറുത്തൽ ചെയ്യണമെന്നുള്ള വാദം തൃപ്തികരമല്ലെന്ന ഞാൻ പറയുന്നത്. ഇതിനുമുമ്പു കഴിഞ്ഞകൌൺസിലിൽ ഇതുപോലെ ഒരു പ്രമേയം വന്നപ്പോൾ ഈ സംഗതി അന്നു ഞാൻ വിവരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. അന്നു ഞാൻ എലക്ടഡ് മെമ്പറായിരുന്നു. ആ വാദംവെച്ചുകൊണ്ടാണ് ഞാൻ ഇപ്പോഴും പറയുന്നത്. സാധുക്കളായ അനവധി സമുദായങ്ങൾ ഇവിടെയുണ്ട്. അതുകൊണ്ട് നോമിനേഷൻ എടുത്തുകളഞ്ഞുകൂടാ. സാധുസമുദായങ്ങളെ പരിരക്ഷിക്കുവാൻ ഉന്നത സമുദായങ്ങൾ എന്താണു ചെയ്യുന്നതെന്നു ചിന്തിക്കുന്നപക്ഷം ഇന്നത്തെ മനസ്ഥിതി മറവുള്ളവരെപ്പോലെ മാറുന്നതുവരെ ഈ നോമിനേഷൻ സമ്പ്രദായം നിറുത്തരുതെന്നാണ് ഞാൻ പറയുന്നത്. ശരിയായിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു നിലപാടു സമുദായങ്ങൾക്കു ലഭിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു നിങ്ങൾ വിചാരിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ സ്റ്റാഫ് സിലക്ഷൻ ബോർഡു വേണമെന്നും സമുദായപ്രാതിനിധ്യം വേണമെന്നും എന്തിനു വാദിച്ചുവെന്നു ഞാൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നു.

മഹാരാജാവു് തിരുമനസ്സിലെ പ്രജകളെല്ലാം ഒരേതരത്തിൽ വിചാരിക്കപ്പെടേണ്ടവരാണ്. അവർക്കു നല്ലതു നിയമനങ്ങളുടെ കാര്യത്തിലും അതുപോലെ വിചാരിച്ചിരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ ഈ സ്റ്റാഫ് സിലക്ഷൻബോർഡുതന്നെ കൊച്ചിയിൽ വരികയില്ലായിരുന്നു. ഈ സംഗതികളെല്ലാം പരിശോധിച്ചുകൊണ്ടാണ പുതിയ ഭരണഘടന വരുമ്പോൾ നമ്മൾ ചിന്തിക്കേണ്ടതു്. ഇത്രമാത്രമെ എനിക്കു പറയുവാനുള്ളു.

Mr. V. N. Damodaran Nambiar *(Trippunittura):* Sir, I happen to be one of those unfortunate members who in a weak moment sent in a resolution recommending further steps towards responsible government in this State. Had I the wisdom to consult my Hon'ble Friend, the Member for Cranganur, I would not have sent it, because now I find that there are insuperable legal difficulties in tabling a motion like that *(laughter)* and also getting the vote of this Hon'ble House. But having sent it, and finding myself in the midst of a debate in regard to the grant of responsible government, though it be of different shades, I feel called upon to say one or two words in connection with the grant of full responsible government, particularly with reference to the transfer of education which I have claimed in my resolution. Simply because I have asked only for placing the Education Department immediately in the hands of a popular Minister, my submission to this House is that I should not be misunderstood to be against the grant of complete responsible government to us. I am one who claims that we have got ample justification in demanding full responsible government at this stage and I shall be only too glad to give my whole-hearted support for the resolution tabled by my Hon'ble Friend, Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar.

Sir, the transfer of the Education Department which I have requested for in my resolution, is not claimed by me as a further

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

step in the grant of constitutional reforms to us. I rather claim it as a delayed step. The transfer of the Education Department ought to have been made as the very first step in the grant of any instalment of responsible government to the people. I would like to explain that aspect of the matter to this Hon'ble House and impress upon the Government that they should not delay one moment the transfer of this very important department, if they want really a proper working and the achievement of the desired results from that working of the other departments that have already been transferred to the control of the popular Minister. His Highness the Maharaja, on the occasion of the inauguration of the reforms contained in the Government of Cochin Act, laid great stress on the importance of quickening the progress of rural development in the State. His Highness has also remarked during his recent visit to Chittur, a rural place in our State, that the Hon'ble Minister has been appointed to see to the welfare and progress of the rural population in this State. I say, there is no use of transferring a set of departments to the hands of a popular representative without at the same time transferring this most important Department of Education which has got an all-round bearing on those Departments, an all-round bearing on the life, customs and manners of the people, especially a vast majority of the people living in the rural areas of our State. I therefore claim that that department in particular should be transferred immediately to the hands of a popular Minister, not as a further step towards the grant of responsible government, but rather as a much delayed step, and as a step which ought to have been taken even at the very first stage, and I request the Government to do it without loosing any more time. In this connection, let me place before the House the views expressed by the Head of Department on education in our State. I am glad to see that he is one with us in this matter. In his interesting and instructive report on the Educational Survey of the State, he expressed this view: "The problem of elementary education is so intimately bound up with the whole problem of modern citizenship that any attempt to study it in isolation from the many problems connected with membership of society is likely to degenerate into a purely academic discussion destitute of all significance to real life". Further on, in his report he continues to observe thus: "Elementary Education is, for instance, one of the most potent factors in rural reconstruction and any educational policy or programme which forgets this point of view is liable to trope about in vague generalities of no material consequence to the well-being of a people". He is also very careful to discern wherein lies the defect in the educational policy of the Government. Further down in his report, he says: "The one obvious characteristic

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

of the organisation of elementary education in Cochin which strikes even the casual observer is the total absence of all popular control". It is in order to remedy this defect of the "total absence of any popular control" in the matter of elementary education in our State that I have tabled this resolution.

Now I will try in a very few words to explain my point a little more in detailed by taking one or two Departments of Government particularly into consideration. Take for example, the Department of Co-operation. I suppose it will be accepted on all hands that without a sufficient realisation of the co-operative ideals and without a sufficient appreciation by the people of the principles underlying the co-operative movement, nothing tangible can be achieved in the matter of improving the economic condition of our rural population. And what does the history of the co-operative movement in our State or for that matter anywhere in British India teach us? It has to be admitted that the Department has not shown sufficient progress or rather it has not shown the progress that we expected of it. The reason, according to me, is mainly because the people have not got that spirit of co-operation in them. It is not at all easy for anybody to instil new habits and new manners and new ideas into people of 40 and 50. It will be much easier or rather it will take an automatic course if we are careful to train the future citizens of our State on proper lines. Supposing we are teaching the fundamentals of co-operation from the very inception to the children in our schools, We can achieve results without any efforts at all on our part and within the course of a generation, we can find that people are imbued with the real spirit of co-operation in them. It is therefore futile and a waste of energy to try to instil by means of propaganda or by any other means a new spirit into people who have passed the age of 40 and 50. Again take the Department of Agriculture. I suppose agriculture is one of the most important occupations that sustain a vast majority of the population of our rural areas. According to the last census, I think, more than 80 per cent of the population of our State are dependant upon this most important industry. The Department of Agriculture had been conducting researches, had been conducting propaganda for a long time past. And what is the result? Have we advanced an inch? Has the Department been able to show any tangible improvement in the methods of agriculture in our State? I am sorry to say that no improvement is visible. What is the reason? I think the reason is to be sought more in the ignorance of the people rather than in any weakness in the efforts made by the Department or by the Government. The people are mostly ignorant and illiterate. Even those who can be considered to be

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

educated do not know the rudiments of agriculture. We do not care to teach the fundamentals of this very important industry to our school children. Why are we not caring to teach the fundamentals of agriculture to our school children? If we had taken care to teach them something about this industry which ought to support them in their later life, we could have now seen a set of people who are competent to sustain themselves, who are ready to be tied up to this industry, who would be willing to stick to their rural homes rather than seek employment in the cities and towns of our State. Therefore, the very first thing that we have to do before transferring any other department is to transfer to popular control this one important Department—Department of Education.

Again, we have now got a set of educational institutions here teaching exclusively certain crafts. What is the objection, I ask, in amalgamating these purely industrial schools with the ordinary academic institutions and then teaching our children the rudiments of these crafts along with the other subjects that we teach them? Will it not be more advantageous? Will it not infuse in them a love for our rural crafts? These are subjects which have to be tackled by the popular representatives. These are subjects which have got some intimate relationship with the welfare and progress of the rural population. I would, therefore, urge that rather as a delayed step, this Department of Education should be transferred immediatly to the hands of a popular Minister. I do not wish to take any more of time of this House as most of the other aspects have been already covered by other members who have spoken before me.

*മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. എ. രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ: മിസ്റ്റർ പ്രസിഡണ്ട് സർ, ആടിന്റെ കുട്ടിക്കും കഴുതയുടെ കുട്ടിക്കും സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം വേണമെന്ന കാലമായിട്ടുണ്ടെന്ന് ഇവിടെ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. അപ്പോൾ മനുഷ്യരുടെ കുട്ടിക്ക് സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം കിട്ടേണ്ട കാര്യത്തെക്കുറിച്ച് രണ്ടുവാക്കു പറഞ്ഞില്ലെങ്കിൽ അക്ഷേപം വന്നാലോ എന്നു വിചാരിച്ച് ഞാനും രണ്ടു വാക്കുപായുവാൻ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചതാണ്. സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം എന്നുള്ളതിന്റെ മഹത്ത്വത്തെപ്പറ്റിയൊ ആവശ്യത്തെപ്പറ്റിയൊ വലിയ പ്രസംഗമൊന്നും ആവശ്യമില്ല. ഇന്ന് കോൺഗ്രസ്സ് മേധാവികളായ പണ്ഡിറ്റ് നെഹറു മുതലായവരെല്ലാം ജയിൽവാസം അനുഭവിക്കുന്നതും ഇതിന്റെ ആവശ്യത്തിനാണെന്ന് പള്ളിക്കൂടത്തിൽ പഠിക്കുന്ന കുട്ടികൾക്കുപോലും അറിയാം. ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് സാമ്രാജ്യം ഘോര സമരത്തിൽ ഇറങ്ങിയിരിക്കുന്നതിന്റെ ആവശ്യവും ഇതിനുവേണ്ടിയാണെന്നാണ് അവർ പറയുന്നത്. നമുക്ക് ഇവിടെ സ്വല്പമായ ഒരു ഭരണസ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം തന്നിട്ട് ഇപ്പോൾ മൂന്നുകൊല്ലത്തോളമായി. ഇതിൽ കൂടുതൽ താമസം ആവശ്യം വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടോ, അതിനു നമ്മൾ പ്രാപ്തരാണോ എന്നാണ് ആദ്യമായി ആലോചിക്കേണ്ടത്. നമ്മൾ അതിനു പ്രാപ്തന്മാരാണെന്ന് ഈ മൂന്നു കൊല്ലത്തിനിടയിൽ തെളിഞ്ഞുകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഗവൺമെൻറുതന്നെ ഒന്നൊ രണ്ടൊ അവസ

*Speech not corrected by the honb'le member

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

രങ്ങളിൽ മന്ത്രിയും ഗവൺമെൻറും തമ്മിൽ യാതൊരു ഭിന്നാഭിപ്രായത്തിനും ഇടവന്നിട്ടില്ലെന്നും, വളരെ ഐകമത്യത്തോടുകൂടിയാണ് കഴിയുന്നതെന്നും പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഈ കൌൺസിലിൻെറ നടപടികൊണ്ടും അതു നാം മനസ്സിലാക്കിക്കഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതുകൊണ്ട് കൂടുതൽ അധികാരം നമുക്കു തരേണ്ട ആവശ്യം വന്നുകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു തെളിഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഇതു നമ്മുടെ കാര്യംമാത്രമാണ്. ഇൻഡ്യാ രാജ്യത്തിലെ ന്യൂ ഒ ഠ-ൽ ചിലപ്രാന്തം നാട്ടുരാജ്യങ്ങൾ നമ്മുടെ കൊച്ചിയിൽ സ്വതന്ത്ര ഭരണം നൽകീട്ടുള്ളതിൻെറ ഗുണദോഷങ്ങളറിയുവാൻ കാത്തിരിക്കുകയാണ്. കൊച്ചിയിൽ ഒരു ചെടി നട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതു് വളരുന്നുണ്ടോ ഇല്ലയോ എന്നു് ഈ നാട്ടുരാജ്യങ്ങളെല്ലാം നോക്കിയിരിക്കുകയാണ്. മൂന്നു കൊല്ലമായിട്ടും ഇതിനു യാതൊരു വളച്ചുയും ഇല്ലെന്നു മനസ്സിലാക്കിയാൽ ഈ ന്യൂ ഒ ഠ നാട്ടുരാജ്യങ്ങളും അവക്കു സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യഭരണം കൊടുക്കുന്നതിൽ അമാന്തിക്കുവാനിടവരും. (ഹീയർ, ഹിയർ) ആ ഏക കാരണത്തിനുമേലെങ്കിലും ഭാരതത്തിൻെറ നന്മക്കുവേണ്ടി ഉടനടി ഇതിനു് വളച്ചുയുണ്ടാക്കണമെന്നാണ് ഞാൻ പറയുന്നതു".

മിസ്റ്റർ വി. ജെ. മത്തായി: അവക്കും ഇതുപോലെ ഒരു ചെടി അവിടെ നട്ടുനോക്കരുതോ?

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. എ. രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ: ഇവിടെ ശരിയായി വളരാത്ത ഒരു ചെടിയാണ് എന്നു കണ്ടുകഴിഞ്ഞാൽ പിന്നെ അവരാരും അതു നട്ടുണ്ടാക്കുവാൻ ശ്രമിക്കുകയില്ല. നാട്ടുരാജ്യങ്ങളായിരിക്കുന്ന മണ്ണിൽ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം വളരുകയില്ലെന്നു അവർ മനസ്സിലാക്കുവാനിടയാകും.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. ആർ. വിശ്വംഭരൻ: മണ്ണു മോശമായിട്ടല്ല, ശരിക്കു വെള്ളമൊഴിക്കാത്തതുകൊണ്ടാണ്.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. എ. രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ: ഇവിടെ നട്ടിട്ടുള്ള ചെടിക്കു വെള്ളമൊഴിക്കുന്നുണ്ടോ വളരുന്നുണ്ടോ എന്നു് അവർ നോക്കിയിരിക്കുകയാണ്. ഈ കാരണത്തിനുമേലെങ്കിലും കൂടുതൽ ഭരണാധികാരം നമുക്കു തരേണ്ടതാണ്.

ഇനി ഒരു കാര്യംകൂടി എനിക്കു പറയുവാനുണ്ട്. അതു് ഈ കൌൺസിൽ തറവാടിനെ ബാധിക്കുന്ന കാര്യമാണ്. കൂടുതൽ മന്ത്രിമാർ വരുമ്പോൾ പാർട്ടിയുടെ എണ്ണമനുസരിച്ചു് ഓരോ പാർട്ടിക്കും ഓരോ മന്ത്രിയെകൊടുത്താൽ നമ്മുടെ തറവാട്ടിലെ കുഴപ്പം തീരും. അങ്ങിനെ കൊടുത്താലും പാർട്ടിയിലും പാർട്ടി വരാനിടയുണ്ട്. അതിൽ തമ്മിൽ തല്ലുവരുമ്പോൾ കൊടുക്കുവാൻവേണ്ടി ഒന്നോ രണ്ടോ മന്ത്രിസ്ഥാനം കൂടി റിസർവ്വ് ചെയ്തുവെച്ചാൽ നന്നായിരിക്കും. അങ്ങിനെ കുഴപ്പംകൂടാതെ കഴിച്ചാൽകൊള്ളാമെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായവുംകൂടി എനിക്കുണ്ട്.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: Sir, I very much regret to oppose the resolution moved by my friend, Mr. T. K. Nayar while I support the resolution moved by the Hon'ble Member Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar. While doing so, I must admit that I feel very sorry that I have to oppose the resolution of my venerable friend, the Leader of the Cochin State Congress Party who was vigorously advocating the grant of full responsible government. In this connection I wish to bring to the notice of the House the fact

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

that a number of resolutions have been passed by this House recommending the grant of responsible government. Of these the last one was the one that was passed on 5th August 1937.

Mr. V. K. Krishnankutty *(Ezhuvas-Trichur):* What was the time ?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* At about 5 o' clock *(Laughter).* And it was passed unanimously by all the non-official members. On that day a cut motion was moved requesting His Highness the Maharaja to appoint a council of ministers for the purpose of carrying on the administration and making that council of ministers responsible to the legislature, provided their responsibility does not extend to the royal family, obligations towards the Paramount Power, Devaswams and some such things. That was passed about 3 years ago, and was passed unanimously. In supporting that motion Mr. T. K. Nayar delivered a very vigorous speech which was applauded by all sides of the House and throughout the length and breadth of this country. And yesterday, as I listend to the speech of Mr. T. K. Nayar advocating a weak resolution, I was very much disappointed. It shows a sort of defeatist mentality or low morale—I do not know what exactly it is.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Pazhayannur):* The latter.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Anyhow, I was very much disappointed *(Laughter).* A great leader, who has been advocating for responsible government, to suddenly change, is a matter I cannot understand. I shall read some portions of the speech he delivered then.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Pazhayannur):* You need not. I admit I have changed since.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* He said: "നിങ്ങളോട് ഞാൻ ഒന്നുകൂടി പറയുന്നു, യാതൊരു വഴക്കും ലഹളയും കൂടാതെ, ഞങ്ങളെക്കൊണ്ടു ജയിൽവാസംകഴിപ്പിക്കാതെ, (ഹീയർ, ഹീയർ) നിങ്ങളുടെ ലാത്തിച്ചാർജ്ജ് ഞങ്ങളുടെമേൽ കൊള്ളിക്കാതെ, ഇരുഭാഗത്തുകാർക്കും സന്തോഷപ്രദമായി കഴിഞ്ഞുകൂടുവാനുള്ള ഒരുവഴി നിങ്ങൾ ആലോചിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതിനുള്ള നല്ല അവസരം ഇതാണെന്നു ഞാൻ നിങ്ങളെ ഓർമ്മപ്പെടുത്തികൊള്ളുന്നു. (ഹീയർ, ഹീയർ) അന്നത്തേപ്പോലെ തിരുവായും ഈ ഭാഗത്തിരിക്കുന്ന ഒരു ഡെസൻ മെമ്പർമാരും പിന്നോക്കംപോകുന്ന ആളുകളാണെന്നു നിങ്ങൾ വിചാരിക്കുന്നുണ്ടോ? (കേൾക്കുവിൻ, കേൾക്കുവിൻ) ഈവക സംഗതികളെല്ലാം ഭാരതപുഴകടന്നു ഇങ്ങോട്ടുവന്നു മെലിഞ്ഞു കറുത്ത ഒരു ചെക്കൻ ഇവിടെനിന്നു പ്രസംഗിക്കുകയാണെന്നു നിങ്ങൾ വിചാരിക്കരുതു്. എന്റെ സഹോദരന്മാരെ! ഞങ്ങളെപ്പോലെതന്നെ ഇവിടെ ഇരുന്നിരുന്ന എന്റെ സഹോദരന്മാരെ! സ്നേഹിതന്മാരെ! നിങ്ങൾ ഞങ്ങളെ വിഡ്ഢിവേഷം കെട്ടിക്കരുതേ."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Such a vigorous speech he delivered for the cause of complete responsible government.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon *(Chittur-Rural):* And what did he get as a result of that ?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* I am coming to it presently.

Now a resolution has been moved by Mr. T. K. Nayar which is not agreeable to the whole House or at least a good portion of it. What I say is, why not we make a demand in the right manner. We shall request, and it is for His Highness either to grant it or not to grant it. So that we shall make our request in a proper form and in a constitutional form. That is why I oppose the resolution sponsored by the Leader of the State Congress Party.

As many of the points I wanted to bring before the House have been covered by the previous speakers on the resolution, I will confine myself to one or two points only. Now we are having a sort of dyarchy and I cannot find words adequate enough to express the discontent that is felt at this system of dyarchy. It is a confused and cumbrous system of government which has been condemned throughout India and outside. But the defects of that system have to a certain extent been mitigated by our able Diwan. Whatever that be, I do not want to say that that system should be continued here for ever. Now Mr. T. K. Nayar suggests that instead of one Minister waiting at the gate of the Diwan requesting for funds, there should be two. It is like a *tarawad* the control of finance of which is vested in the *karanavan*. So long as that is so, what is the power of the junior members of that *tarawad* ? They may be asked by the *karanavan* to go to such and such a place or to conduct such and such a case. For all their financial needs, they have to depend on the *karanavan*. That is not the state of affairs that we want. We want the control of the purse as well. If that is done it will be quite right. I do not want any half-way house between responsible government and dyarchy—the present system of government.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* What is that half-way house ?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* A house between the present system and complete responsible government. You may call it a half-way house within a half-way house if you may so like it. Such a system I do not want. That is why I oppose the first resolution. The resolution of Mr. Subramania Ayyar as it is now

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

worded will not be either acceptable to the Government or His Highness the Maharaja, because as the House is well aware, His Highness has entered into treaty obligations towards the Paramount Power. *e.g.* He has to pay annually, Rs. 2,00,000 to the Imperial Crown. Suppose we are given full responsible government and our Ministers refuse to pay the tribute, what will be the position of our Maharaja? Therefore, on the face of it, this resolution will not be acceptable to His Highness the Maharaja. If the cabinet of ministers say; "we are not going to pay the tribute to the Crown". Then, what will His Highness do? He will not be able to do anything, because he has no control.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* If the Ministers refuse to pay, the Paramount Power will take it.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* How can they do that? What authority have they got? The contract is between the Maharaja and the Paramount Power. If he gives all the powers to His ministers, how can he conform to the contract?

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Through the Ministers.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* The Ministers will be within their rights when they refuse to pay the tribute.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* If they refuse to pay, the British troops will come and take it. That is what happened in Coimbatore.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* That may be in olden days. But those times are now gone.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* What happened in the Trichur riots?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Those are all old stories.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Troops will come and take you there. There are already troops in the Willingdon Island.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Don't advocate the cause of the Paramount Power.

Mr. K. R. Viswambharan *(Ezhuvas-Talappalli):* This Council cannot discuss matters regarding treaty relations.

Panel Chairman: Order, order. The hon'ble member will proceed with his speech.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* The best way of overcoming this difficulty would be to make adequate provision in the Act itself limiting the field of responsibility of ministers so that ministers will not be responsible for His Highness' relations with the Paramount Power, etc. In that case, the Maharaja will be free. The ministers also will be free. Professor Keith also suggests something on these lines. The Maharaja has got two functions—His external relations and internal relations. With regard to internal relations, the Maharaja has absolute power. With regard to external relations, he has to abide by treaty relations with the Paramount Power. He cannot come into agreement with France or Germany, with Hitler or Mussolini. But with regard to internal administration, the Maharaja can give full responsible government.

Panel Chairman: So you accept Mr. Subramania Ayyar's resolution with that limitation?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Yes.

A resolution of this nature may be objected to by the Government. Therefore, my submission to this House is that treaty relations with the Paramount Power may be made beyond the ambit of the ministers' powers. There the matter ends. Then, other internal matters may be left to the control of ministers as it is done in British India. Only the internal affairs are controlled by the Ministers. Education, collection of revenue—are these not internal matters?

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* What about Devaswams?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* That is a religious institution. In the motion that was passed 3 years before, by the Council this has been considered and provided. I have no objection to exclude that, from the field of responsibility of the Ministers.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* What about Churches?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* What about Synagogues? Has the Maharaja any control over the churches? I ignore this meaningless interruptions. So, I suggest certain change in the wording of the resolution as indicated in my speech.

I want to submit some other points also. My Hon'ble Friend Mr. Mathai wanted two conditions to be satisfied before granting responsible government. He wants the abolition of the communal electorates and the introduction of adult franchise. Why does my friend want those conditions to be satisfied now? When responsible government is introduced the Council of Ministers can abolish the system of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

communal electorate if it is not in the public interest. So also the Council of Ministers can introduce the system of adult franchise after the introduction of responsible government. By insisting upon these conditions now, the grant of responsible government may be postponed. Therefore, I object to these. I say that responsible government may be granted soon after the war is over. I agree with my friend that responsible government should not be granted to this House before the general election is over. It should be given only after the general election, and after informing the voters that responsible government is proposed to be given. The election should be conducted on that basis. I have some other minor suggestions to make. We have got a nominated President. I say that it is high time to stop that. The Diwan should be the Leader of the House. He should sit where Dr. A. R. Menon is sitting now and Dr. A. R. Menon should sit where Mr. Achyuta Menon is sitting. The Diwan should not be the President of the Council *(Hear, hear)*. That is a change which can easily be introduced. We must have an elected President and an elected Deputy President. This can be done even without responsible government. Now there is this difficulty. The President of the Council is the custodian of the rights and privileges of the House. If the Diwan is the President it is but human that he sometimes forgets that he is the President of the Council.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* In Mysore the Diwan is not the President.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* This does not create any difficulty. Then, why should this House be called the Council? In British India and in Travancore it is called the Assembly. The Council is really the Upper House. We should therefore call it the Assembly, for uniformity. In British Indian Provinces the Upper House is called the Council. People outside think that we are not popular members, but only a council of elders. That may therefore be rectified. These are some of my suggestions.

*__Dr. A. R. Menon__ *(Minister for Rural Development):* Sir, at the very outset I wish to congratulate my friend Mr. Subramaina Ayyar for the very able and lucid speech delivered in presenting his resolution to this House. I am sure that the House also will agree that he has studied the subject and presented it in a form which is very intelligible to all; but this is a very complicated question, and at the very outset the two propositions that face before us are, whether to support the resolution moved by the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition or the one moved by my friend, the Hon'ble Member

* Speech not corrected by the hon'ble member

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

for Nemmara. The difference between the two resolutions is this, that while the Leader of the Opposition fully realises that another step should be taken in the direction of still further reforms he also realises taking into consideration various aspects that the demand for full responsible government is rather too much to ask at present. As I understood his speech and as he has explained later on, he is by no means second to anyone in this Council in thinking that our people are fit for full responsible government or for that matter that he is not against this proposition. But, from past bitter experience, he has learned to regulate his ambitions and desires by those limitations which are generally imposed in dealing with public questions.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* What is the past bitter experience?

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* Unless you demand things consistent with the possibility of translating them into action, those desires, however vehemently expressed they may be, will not materialise.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* How can you anticipate what they are going to do?

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* There is such a thing in making a request that the person who makes the request is expected to consider various aspects, if he is to be taken seriously. If it is only a question of getting a few votes or for election purposes, perhaps that attitude may be the correct one. All are born equal and all must have equal votes. I myself am a trained campaigner in election matters, and I know the value that such a declaration in this House may have upon certain portions of the population.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* What is the imputation?

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* It is not an imputation. There are so many members. Does the show fit you? There are other members who never objected. I was saying, on an interruption from Mr. Moothedan, why the mover of the resolution restricted the scope of the resolution. From his bigger experience, he restricted it, thinking that his demands must be moderate so that he may achieve the end in view. *(Hear, hear).* But I added that if his intention was to make a good speech only, he will be justified in making such a declaration here.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* The Minister made a statement here that this is done for catching votes. You are implying thereby

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

that the members who spoke for full responsible government made those speeches for catching votes Why do you wound the feelings of members?

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* Is there any single member who has wounded almost all the members of the House as the hon'ble member sitting there? Members have been sometimes smarting for 24 hours in this House.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* I rise to a point of order. The Minister was saying that those who made speeches for full responsible government are thereby courting votes. In making that statement the Minister is casting an insinuation upon the Members.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* I was simply analysing what Mr. T. K. Nayar's method of speech would be.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* In that case you can go on.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* Thank you, Sir. In introducing this resolution, there was some criticism about the departments you have selected. What are the departments? Public Education, Public Works and Medical. Why has he selected these three? These are the three nation-building departments that affect almost the whole population of this State, and very cleverly he selected these three departments. Here, it is only the question of spending and not collecting revenues. No popular Member of this House as a rule likes to advocate taxes or even to collect taxes. Those of us who depend upon the votes of the people for our very existence are really reluctant either to advocate additional taxation however we may be able to show that it is necessary, nor are they willing to actually operate the machinery for collection of taxes. I think the member had this in view in selecting these three departments. What are the respective merits of the resolutions? In the case of the resolution moved by my friend, Mr. Nayar, he says; "here is a structure built up by the energies and exertions of generations of administrators through ages, and we find this structure requires certain alterations; we have made some alterations a couple of years ago and further alteration is necessary." Therefore, he says, "make a few more alterations in the superstructure built by the energies of series of administrators through ages." On the other hand, the other resolution says, "demolish the whole thing and put up a new building in its place." In one case, by making alterations in the old building it will assume some shape and some form in a few

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

years, whereas in the other the old building has to be demolished and we should have a new building. A wise person who has an old house, if he can possibly help it, will make such alterations in his house so as to suit his present needs rather than destroy the old one and put up a new building, unless necessity compels him to do so. I am asking, has such a necessity arisen that this building built up by the exertions and energies of a series of administrators through generations and ages should be destroyed and a new one put up, or such alterations as the spirit of the times and the necessity of the situation demand will suffice. I personally do not think what answer I should give. You may call me a conservative. But, there is an element of virtue even in conservatism. I was discussing with the Secretary to Government on the passing of a legislation and what that piece of legislation has brought us within these 20 years to the detriment of the nation. Therefore, it is not always a quality in public life that you must rush through things. That spirit of reservation and that spirit of conservatism are vices in a public man or in a Legislative Council. There is another point. Are all the achievements and the knowledge accrued by this method of government always to be thrown away all at once or are we to absorb a great deal of this good and nourishing thing into our system? These are the two differences between these two systems. I do not see why the Leader of the Opposition should be taken to task as though he is a reactionary, that he has only mentioned these subjects. I have been hearing criticism after criticism about him simply because he has limited the resolution to these three departments. Practicability, caution, utility, and a sense of proportion—all these combined made him to take the attitude of compromise, for the essence of democracy is compromise and people who do not know and who do not understand the spirit of compromise will not succeed in democracy. Where is that spirit of compromise in this discussion?

Mr. K. R. Viswambharan *(Ezhuvas-Talappalli):* How can you compromise with a bureaucracy?

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* In the matter of changes, the views of a large number of people should be assembled.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* It is a compromise between the party in power and the people that we want, and not a compromise between an irresponsible bureaucracy and the people.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* We have been hearing a lot about responsible government. What is

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

responsible government? If responsible government connotes government of the people by the people and for the people—if that is the definition, I believe that is what is meant—I have nothing to say except to offer such criticisms on that definition. But if responsible government connotes a system of government irrespective of other systems of government, I do not subscribe to that view.

Mr. T. V. Subramania Ayyar *(Nemmara):* In that view even autocracy can be justified.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* Two propositions have to be proved. You will have to prove that a government elected by the people for the people and through the people always creates responsibility and at the same time you will have to prove that any other form of government is irresponsible.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* Such a government will go by the hands of the people.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* I shall enumerate a thousand and one cases where irresponsible democracy sat in the legislature and refused to go without any difficulty whatsoever. The democracy has become so irresponsible that in spite of the vehement protests and the unanimous condemnation of their action they sometimes manage to cling to office.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* The life of such a government should be threatened by the wish of the people.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* I am making a statement of fact. Do you mean to say that any other form of government is irresponsible in the sense that they are not responsible to the people? Therefore responsible government should be government of the people by the people and through the people. Unfortunately, that word "responsibility" has been mis-used and the word so used for a number of years has become a truism.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* The ideal on which this resolution is based is responsible Government. If you are condemning democracy now, you are not for that form of government.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* Historians, economists and others will tell you what it is. What is this democracy? If you have got a form of government called oligarchy, that oligarchy, when the number is increased, gradually becomes a democracy. When the number is increased, the oligrachy gradually becomes democracy. There is no democracy, and there has never been a democracy in the world till almost very very lately when all

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the men and women were given votes. Yet, they call this democracy. The complete representation of a population is not necessary for democracy. For instance, the United States of America which prides itself as a democratic State had only conceded votes to women only very lately and women form more than 50 per cent of the population of that great republic.

Mr. Puthur Achyuta Menon *(Kottur)*: Is the Hon'ble Minister speaking on behalf of Government or in his individual capacity?

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development)*: I speak only as a member of the Council.

Panel Chairman: This refers not to the Minister's portfolio.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development)*: The Government Secretary will answer on behalf of Government. Now, what are the conditions necessary for democracy? The conditions are at least two. One is that there must be a general education passing through the various strata of society and as a result acquire political power. I perfectly concede that through the wisdom of our rulers at a time without anyone to press them or represent them they had the foresight to give sound education and general education to the population of this State, so that we, today, stand foremost in the matter of general education and in that way general education, as one of the fundamentals for a democratic institution, is obtainable in the State. What is the second point? The second is a spirit of compromise, a uniformity of debate, non-presence of communal tension. These are the essential conditions of the success of democracy.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Cholakkudi)*: We cannot have that ideal state of affairs.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development)*: Now, fortunately we are achieving that communal unanimity. I have no doubt that within a few years we will be able to achieve that amount of unanimity that is essential to run a full democracy successfully.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Cholakkudi)*: Not so far as communal electorates exist.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development)*: So long as communal electorates exist there shall not be communal union. But those who came here through the electorates do not agree with you. What is to be done? They know what is good for them. It is only when they get their people to realise that the majority will do what

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

is right and proper that they will forego this special representation and this special right. As Mr. Kutty stated we must feel that this small minority will be treated with fairness and consideration before we will give up those special concessions granted to them. I am speaking of the facts. Therefore, it will be the duty of the members of this House and the public workers and it will be the duty of the general public to do everything in their power to remove the inequalities and animosities arising from communal and religious feelings. It is an essential condition before we can lay down the full foundation of a democracy.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* If the argument is that if democracy should succeed there should be communal unanimity and that otherwise we can expect injustice from democracy in the partial democracy now granted, do you mean to say that unless communal unanimity is obtained injustice will be meted out?

Dr. A.R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* I was only making some general observations about democracy.

Panel Chairman: He was not supporting or opposing the resolution. He was making a general acadamic discussion about democracy and the factors that will contribute to the success of democracy. I hope, you will require some time more to finish your speech.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Minister for Rural Development):* About half an hour more.

The House rose for the day at 5 p.m.

C. J. MATHEW
Secretary to the Council

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly